CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.832
12 August 1999

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 12 August 1999, at 10.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Guillermo Enrique González (Argentina)

GE.99-65462 (E)

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I declare open the 832nd plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

As you are aware, our esteemed colleague and friend Ambassador Mark Moher of Canada will be leaving the Conference very shortly, having been called by his authorities to other important duties. Ambassador Moher arrived four years ago, at a crucial time, when the negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty were entering their final stage, and he injected into our deliberations a remarkable blend of deep knowledge of the issues under negotiation, an ingredient of iron-clad logic and a special ability to build bridges between opposing views. His personal contribution as "Friend of the Chair on on-site inspections" in the framework of the "Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban" testified to those abilities. His unflagging efforts to promote the start of negotiations on a ban on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons culminated in his appointment last year as Chairman of the Committee established to that effect. His unwavering commitment to the Conference on Disarmament has been demonstrated in his many proposals aimed at forging a consensus on the programme of work of the Conference. I am sure that I speak on behalf of us all when I say that we will sincerely miss him. I wish you Ambassador Moher, and your family the success which you deserve and which you will, I am sure, continue to enjoy in this further stage in your career.

On my list of speakers for today are the representatives of Kenya, Ecuador, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Tunisia, Canada, New Zealand, Brazil, Cuba, Finland, Japan, South Africa, Bangladesh, Turkey, Slovenia and the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite the representative of Kenya, Ambassador Kipkorir Aly Azad Rana to take the floor.

Mr. RANA (Kenya): Mr. President, I have asked for the floor briefly to air some comments about the expansion of the membership of this Conference. But first of all, I would like to convey my delegation's appreciation of the efforts you have been making in steering the Conference's work and finding a consensus on a work programme at this particularly difficult time.

I would also like to endorse the statement which was made at the last plenary session by the distinguished Ambassador of India on behalf of the G-21, welcoming the five newly admitted member States. Kenya joins other CD delegations in warmly welcoming Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia to our midst. Kenya already maintains close links with most of these countries, and in particular with some, under various auspices including continental and commercial groupings.

In the new seating configuration following this expansion, my delegation is now flanked on one side by Kazakhstan, and on the other, by Malaysia. We are therefore likely to be the first beneficiaries - or victims - of the radiation of the fresh energy which they will surely bring to this forum.

It is nevertheless regrettable that it took so long to adopt the decision to admit the five new members. My delegation persistently has been of the view that the Conference on Disarmament should be open to those States

(Mr. Rana, Kenya)

willing to join and participate in its activities. In this way, the Conference could rid itself of the image it has built, i.e. that of an exclusivist forum for pedantics, polemics and abstract exchanges.

On the question of further expansion, it has been argued in some quarters that increased numbers in membership will impact negatively on the work of the Conference such as by slowing down or impeding negotiations. Experience has however demonstrated that success or progress of the Conference's work in terms of either the conclusion of treaties or the adoption of decisions is conditional upon factors other than the mere numbers of membership. The most important of these is probably the political disposition of member States to demonstrate a sense of flexibility which is vital for arriving at a consensus, and the goodwill to substantively address all issues on the Conference's agenda, including the sensitive ones.

Right now, for example, the CD is still unable to agree on a programme of work for this year. We therefore remain stuck in a quagmire. Attempts to move out of it have so far not been successful. The CD thus runs the risk of closing the year on this rather low note.

In the view of my delegation, this state of affairs is not attributable to membership numbers. It is rather a result of the absence of the will on the part of some delegations to address all issues on the CD agenda in good faith. Indeed with a higher or lower number of members, the CD would still be stuck so long as the spirit of compromise and good will was lacking.

We hope therefore in this regard that those delegations which are still consulting on the currently contentious issues will hasten the process in order for the CD to get out of the present impasse.

Allow me, Mr. President, to join you in wishing Ambassador Moher of Canada farewell. We extend to him our best wishes and wish him success in all his future endeavours and like you, we will all miss his contributions, which have been very incisive and perceptive.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Kenya for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Ecuador, Ambassador Luis Gallegos-Chiriboga.

Mr. GALLEGOS-CHIRIBOGA (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): When the United Nations was established in the aftermath of the Second World War, the disasters of war and a universal awareness of the historic importance of eradicating them led the founding States of the Organization to set among the highest priorities on its agenda the questions of disarmament and the reduction of the arms race. The countries which form part of the United Nations took on the same commitment when we signed the Charter of the Organization. Disarmament is not some rhetorical device or a mechanism which can be established without difficulties. We all know that nations acquire weapons and confront each other as a result of problems of a manifest complexity, the fruit of disputes a full understanding of which is frequently beyond even those involved themselves, or factors reflecting interests which

(Mr. Gallegos Chiriboga, Ecuador)

have deep historical roots. However, although there have always been disputes among human groups, seemingly they have existed since the origins of mankind, and common sense suggests that such conflict will continue among peoples in the future, it is no less true that following the shattering lessons in inhumanity we received in the First and Second World Wars, the community of Nations agreed on a reasonable principle: disputes should be settled solely by peaceful means and recourse to war is appropriate only in the extreme case of self-defence.

The history of mankind is in a certain way an account of how people manage to reach agreement on principles of general value following major disagreements and confrontations, only to observe that ahead of them lie similar or greater efforts to carry such principles into practice. The United Nations and its work in the sphere of disarmament illustrate very clearly this human dynamic. Following the signing of the Charter of San Francisco and following the signing of the Declaration of Human Rights - to recall another key document in international law - we found ourselves facing a long road ahead to crystallize their mandates. It is a long road, but like any long road one has to set out as early as possible and with plenty of energy if one wishes to get anywhere. The Conference on Disarmament is the instrument available to the international community to put into practice the principles of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. It is the vehicle which can enable us to pursue the path of non-violence, tolerance and the calming of spirits with greater distinction and vigour.

Ecuador wishes to express once again its appreciation to the Conference on Disarmament, which has unanimously decided to admit a new Latin American country to its ranks. In my statement on 24 June, I conveyed to all of you the principles which guide my country's position with respect to the matters currently before the Conference. With those guidelines, which Ecuador is pleased to find are similar to those of other fraternal countries, we plan to embark on the path to be followed by this Conference in the future, which we hope will lead us step by step to objectives of peace and fraternity, the reduction of tensions and the effective limitation of the means of war. The construction of a weapon-free world is not the result of chance. Violence is not dismantled without persistent work to do away with the arms build-up and warlike violence. Disarmament can only be the fruit of the conscious triumph of the human spirit and reason.

The work of the Conference, to which my country wishes to contribute in a determined and enthusiastic manner, has a special dimension if we view its purposes not merely as the key to a world free from violence but as a vehicle to provide security and development for millions of human beings. The doctrine of collective security has not lost its validity. The link between disarmament and development is an undeniable reality. The security of nations is not restricted to the important question of material security, which averts the destruction resulting from war and the disasters caused by weapons. Security also has a dimension which is expressed in development, and whose effects encompass all of mankind. In the view of Ecuador, the Conference on Disarmament must concentrate on its technical and specialized activities, but

(Mr. Gallegos-Chiriboga, Ecuador)

without losing sight of the ultimate scope of its efforts. In other words, the stalemate in the work of the Conference on Disarmament ultimately affects the collective security objectives and the development of States.

Within the Conference, Ecuador will coordinate its positions first of all through the Group of 21. Yesterday, my country was admitted to that group. We are honoured to participate in a group with which we have common positions and with whose members we have a lengthy history of diplomatic relations. This commits us to contributing to the activities of this Conference through the Group of 21, which of course does not rule out an openness of spirit on the part of Ecuador and a will to work with the other groups and countries in the CD. Ecuador looks to all of you members of the CD as partners in shouldering the great responsibility of addressing issues on which the welfare of future generations, our peoples and our families, will to a large extent depend. In this respect I would like to reiterate to the Conference Ecuador's appreciation for the unanimous decision to admit my country and four other countries to the Forum. We view that decision as reflecting the commitment by the Conference to the principles of representativeness and participation by States in international matters of concern to them. Representativeness and participation are basic to the construction of a democratic international system. Ecuador attaches special importance to those parameters, which do not contradict, but rather are vital to, the genuine realization of the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness in the work of international institutions.

Numbers are not necessarily a sign of greater or lesser effectiveness. There are international bodies with a small membership which have had a long history of inefficiency. It is true that effectiveness is founded on efficient procedures, but no procedure will be sufficient without, above all, the political will to foster the work of an organization. In this respect, the maxim concerning the United Nations, to the effect that it is and does only what its members permit, applies perfectly to the Conference on Disarmament. The successes and limitations of the Conference on Disarmament are ultimately attributable to the States which constitute it. Success in which the agenda of the Conference is applied effectively, which excludes no topic and which gives priority to matters of utmost international import will be a success attributable to all those of us who are members of this Forum.

Ecuador views its admission to the Conference on Disarmament as in a sense the culmination of its steadfast policy with respect to disarmament, expressed in the United Nations General Assembly as well as in the regional framework and the bilateral sphere. My country is very proud to be a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which ushered in a new way of seeing and operating in nuclear disarmament in the world. In turn, it has close links with the Non-Aligned Movement, of which it has been a member for more than 20 years, and which emerged on the international scene as a reaction to the politico-ideological confrontation which characterized the cold war. These examples of Ecuador's international commitment to peace and security, to global disarmament, also find expression in Ecuador's foreign policy with respect to its own special problems. Last year Ecuador and the Republic of Peru signed a set of agreements which brought a peaceful and negotiated end to

(Mr. Gallegos-Chiriboga, Ecuador)

a dispute which stemmed from the nineteenth century and which on various occasions had resulted in armed confrontation between two brother peoples. The determination of the people and Government of Ecuador was decisively displayed in support of a final solution to the dispute and the ushering in of a new stage of relations between the two countries. The Government of Ecuador thereby gave clear proof of its faith in the virtues of peaceful solutions, and in the construction of a climate of international collective security based not on military non-confrontation but on dialogue and cooperation between States.

Ecuador aspires to working with the other members of the Conference on Disarmament to promote the goals which bring us to this Forum. They will always find in my country a member with a constructive spirit, a pragmatic enthusiasm and a determination to rule out no path which can lead to a world which is safer, more fairly developed and more tolerant and fraternal.

On behalf of my delegation I would like to thank those who made Ecuador's entry to the Conference on Disarmament possible. Many who worked in a constructive spirit and displayed gestures of friendship which I will remember enabled the process to reach a successful conclusion. I would reiterate what was said by my delegation in this room last week and place on record my appreciation to the Permanent Representatives of the four countries joining with Ecuador, the Presidents of the Conference on Disarmament, and all of you. Most particularly, I would like to place on record my gratitude to you, Mr. President, and to express my admiration for your professionalism and devotion to the cause of peace. I feel very honoured to be the first Ambassador of Ecuador to occupy the post in this room and to bear witness before you that the people and Government of the Republic of Ecuador are confident that the mechanisms for peaceful negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament will banish the use of the instruments of destruction and death.

Before concluding, I would like to endorse your words concerning Ambassador Moher and to wish him success in his personal and professional life.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Ecuador for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Kazakhstan, Mr. Nurlan Onzhanov.

Mr. ONZHANOV (Kazakhstan) (translated from Russian): At the outset I would like to express sincere gratitude for the decision to admit Kazakhstan to full membership of the Conference on Disarmament, which we interpret as recognition of the active efforts our country has made in the field of disarmament and the strengthening of peace and security. I would like to express particular gratitude to the present President of the Conference, Mr. González, for his personal contribution to moving forward the issue of the expansion of the membership of the CD and its positive outcome, and also to thank other delegations for their support.

Kazakhstan demonstrated its dedication to the cause of freeing the world from nuclear weapons when it acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of

(Mr. Onzhanov, Kazakhstan)

Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear State in December 1993. After the removal of the last nuclear warheads from its territory in April 1995 and the destruction of the remaining nuclear installation at the Semipalatinsk test site on 31 May 1995, Kazakhstan became the second State after South Africa to have voluntarily renounced the possession of nuclear weapons. In the light of the need for strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime in every possible way, Kazakhstan signed the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty in 1996. Our country has been making a practical contribution to enhancing the effectiveness of monitoring of compliance with the provisions of the CTBT. Work has begun on re-equipping seismic stations in Kazakhstan capable of locating underground events thousands of kilometres away as part of the global monitoring network. The former Semipalatinsk test site is a unique facility, where work is now under way to use its infrastructure to develop methods for monitoring nuclear explosions and to prepare equipment in the context of the CTBT Organization's programme of explosions for calibration purposes being carried out on the test site.

I would like to point out that currently an essential feature of the mechanism for strengthening global security is its multilateral nature, that is, focused, agreed and multilateral efforts, the path of cooperation, the search for common approaches and mutually acceptable solutions. The activities of the CD as a unique multilateral negotiating forum on vital issues make it possible to adopt effective measures relating to the non-proliferation and prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, global disarmament and preventing the arms race.

Kazakhstan is in favour of steady step-by-step nuclear disarmament through the fulfilment of commitments by all States members of the NPT, both nuclear and non-nuclear. The first step on this path should be controlling the production of fissile material. The considerable stockpiles of enriched uranium and plutonium worldwide, and also the large amounts of fissile material derived from the destruction of warheads, are a threat from the standpoint of non-proliferation. Therefore, Kazakhstan is in favour of beginning negotiations in the CD on the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for military purposes.

Non-nuclear States are justified in raising the issue of security assurances and have the right to expect firm legal security assurances. In this connection, Kazakhstan fully shares the view that security assurances should have the legally binding force of an international instrument. One possible means of resolving this issue might be the adoption of a protocol on security assurances which would be an integral part of the treaty itself.

Transparency in armaments is essential in order to prevent the destabilizing accumulation of weapons in any region or the flooding of arms into any State. In this context Kazakhstan is in favour of limiting the international arms trade since this problem is becoming increasingly acute. While not a prime cause of conflicts, arms deliveries do feed them. This can be seen in almost all the regional conflicts in the world today. We believe

(Mr. Onzhanov, Kazakhstan)

that the main task here should be the creation of an international mechanism to help resolve this problem. Such a mechanism might be based on the Register of Conventional Arms, which includes data submitted by States parties on their arms exports and imports, national production and policies in this field.

In conclusion, I would like to assure you that Kazakhstan will be making every effort to ensure the effective work of the Conference on Disarmament.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Kazakhstan for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia, Mr. Ahmed Jazri Mohammed Johar.

Mr. JAZRI (Malaysia): Mr. President, as this is the first time that my delegation is taking the floor under your presidency, please accept our further heartfelt congratulations that under your presidency, decision CD/1588 was adopted, thus enabling our delegation's membership. My Ambassador, who is away to participate in a meeting in Beirut, conveys his heartfelt appreciation and best wishes to you and to all members of the Conference. My delegation would also like to join you in bidding His Excellency Ambassador Mark Moher farewell and extending best wishes in his next assignment.

Like almost all delegations, my delegation was caught by a most pleasant surprise at last week's plenary. We therefore wish to take the opportunity today to formally place on record my delegation's appreciation to all members of the Conference for having finally managed to adopt its decision on expansion admitting five new members, including Malaysia. We also pledge our fullest cooperation to you, Mr. President, and to this Conference in its work to achieve the common goals of the Conference on Disarmament. We stress the importance that Malaysia attaches to the continued role and relevance of the Conference as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament which every effort should be made to preserve, strengthen and promote. My delegation pledges its fullest effort to help regain the credibility of this Conference to meet the expectations of the international community and to make this world a more peaceful and safer place for mankind today and for the generations to come.

The admission of these five new members is one step forward in addressing the issue of the expansion of the Conference. We still have 21 States that have submitted their requests for membership. As sovereign States these requests and all future requests should not be left in a state of uncertainty, but should be duly respected and given due consideration. They deserve attention and a formal reply by the Conference. Paragraph 2 of the rules of procedure of the Conference states that "The membership of the Conference will be reviewed at regular intervals". There is no clarity with regard to the process and procedure in this rule and its ambiguity should be addressed and rectified.

My delegation can still recall the difficulties of including in the Conference's annual programme of work a decision to appoint a Special Coordinator on expansion. Last year's Special Coordinator, His Excellency Ambassador Erwin Hofer of Switzerland, took up the challenge and has proven

(Mr. Jazri, Malaysia)

that despite the apparent lack of interest on the part of some members to address the issue of its expansion, he was able, with his skills and ability to convince the Conference and thereby this interim mini-expansion has been achieved. It was not without difficulty but with a lot of dedication and hard work. I wish to draw attention to Ambassador Hofer's report, as contained in CD/PV.807, that the Conference should address the unfinished business of expansion. My delegation wishes to express its support for further expansion of the Conference.

My delegation would also have wished to have joined the Conference at a time when the Conference had a clear direction. We would further request that the Conference find a solution to its present state of impasse. Consultations should be undertaken during the interim period to ensure that no time is wasted on procedural matters at next year's session. The Conference should also learn from the disadvantaged state that the Conference finds itself in as a result of procedural difficulties to exercise true flexibility and not mere words with no meaning. The Conference on Disarmament had a purpose and objective for its establishment and should not allow itself to fail. All members, especially the nuclear-weapon States, have an obligation to live up to the cause of this Conference.

An important body like this one should take advantage of and into consideration the resources, experience and ideas of its members and the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly which represent the international community. It might also take into consideration the views that are being expressed by the various interested organizations. No efforts should be spared and no time should be wasted. The Conference is, I am sure, as eager as my delegation is to get to work on the real business of the Conference.

It is disheartening to see the Conference fail to embark on real work since the negotiations on the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty in 1996. In fact the Conference should by now admit that there is little prospect of any substantive work for this year given that we have only four weeks left in this third part of the 1999 session. It is clear that the CD faces this difficulty as a direct result of its procedural setbacks, and the Conference should seriously give some attention to resolving this.

It is important to overcome whatever negative impact the impasse over the last two years or three years (if we count this year) might have had on the CD. It is important first of all for the Conference to address certain aspects of its work methods, decision-making process and institutional arrangements which might have affected its efficacy, and to find for itself a clear road map and a reliable compass to help steer the multilateral negotiating process forward in the post-cold-war era. It will have to have a sense of urgency and a commitment to achieving tangible results. It will have to improve its decision-making methods and strengthen its essential consensus-building approach. My delegation is confident that the members of the CD will find collective wisdom and creativity in fine-tuning the work methods of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Malaysia for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Tunisia, Ambassador Kamel Morjane.

Mr. MORJANE (Tunisia) (translated from French): Mr. President, since obviously I am taking the floor for the first time, allow me at the outset, on behalf of the Tunisian delegation, to congratulate you on taking the Chair and wish you every success in your efforts at this decisive phase of the annual session of the Conference. My congratulations also go to Mr. Petrovsky, Secretary-General of the Conference, and his deputy, Mr. Bensmail, for their willingness to assist and the impetus which they have always managed to give to the work of the Conference.

I would like to express my country's pride and deep satisfaction at becoming a full member of the Conference. My country's satisfaction following its admission is in keeping with the very lengthy wait it has endured since it knocked on the Conference's door in 1982. In this connection my delegation would like to thank most warmly and express its gratitude to all the member countries which decided to admit the group of five to this body. At the same time I would like to single out Ambassador Hofer for the tireless and commendable efforts he made as Special Coordinator on the question of the expansion of the Conference, which made it possible to enhance its universality with the admission of this new group.

Tunisia would have liked all countries that have applied to join the Conference to be admitted, irrespective of the date of their applications. Having cooperated and coordinated its efforts with them over a long period in the context of the informal consultations on the expansion issue, Tunisia, now a full member of the Conference, will continue to work to meet their legitimate demands.

Since its accession to independence and in particular since the change of 1987 under the leadership of President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, Tunisia has been devoting the bulk of its budgetary resources to human development, keeping to a minimum allocations to its military capabilities to guarantee its defence. In addition my country, like other peace-loving countries, has always felt serious concern at the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction around the world. It also deplores the fact that many developing countries have been allocating substantial resources to increasing their military capacity to the detriment of their economic and social development. With this kind of concern in mind it is obvious that my country has an interest in global disarmament and the negotiating process aimed at achieving it. Through its application to join the Conference on Disarmament Tunisia is not trying to derive prestige but to make a modest contribution to strengthening international peace and security, the objectives of the Conference.

With the increase in the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, some member States have expressed concern with respect to both the efficient functioning of the Conference and the effective participation of its members in its work. While we understand these concerns, my delegation would like to

(Mr. Morjane, Tunisia)

emphasize that such considerations, however realistic they may be, should not be to the prejudice of potential candidates for joining the Conference in the future. What is at stake is the credibility of the multilateral system, based on the principles of democracy and equality between States. Nevertheless, we share the view that in future appropriate rules should be set regulating the frequency of and arrangements for admission to the Conference in order to avoid any obstacles to the proper functioning of the Conference. At all events, and beyond all such considerations, it is undeniable that strengthening universality is an essential factor for increasing the influence of the Conference and enhancing its impact on international public opinion. This should be borne in mind by its members.

While reiterating our pledge of full cooperation with you, Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the four other new members who have joined the Conference together with us, and before concluding, allow me to convey greetings to Ambassador Moher and wish him every success in his future duties

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Tunisia for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Canada, Ambassador Mark Moher.

Mr. MOHER (Canada): Mr. President, it is of course a very great pleasure for me to address the plenary under the presidency of Argentina, and especially with you, a good friend and colleague, in the Chair. Certainly one of the most positive features of my stay in Geneva has been the friendship and cooperation between Canada and Argentina and between our two teams, and I appreciate that. I also want to thank you for the very kind words you expressed at the beginning of this plenary. I particularly welcome the reference to iron-clad logic rather than to iron-bound views, and I hope that my comments here today will not reinforce the latter comment or perception. I want also to thank all of those in the CD who in recent days and weeks have expressed over-generous assessments of me and of my efforts to contribute to this Conference.

Today is my final opportunity to address the plenary in order to share some perceptions, to bid farewell and to extend my sincere best wishes to all for the future. First I would like to start out with perceptions.

My time in the CD has been both highly rewarding and intensely frustrating. During my first 18 months the major challenge was to conclude negotiation of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty and to secure its successful launch through processes in New York and in Geneva. The reward, clearly, was to see the CTBTO established in Vienna under the capable leadership of our former colleague Wolfgang Hoffman of Germany. It is obviously my strong hope that steps will be vigorously pursued in capitals and in the first Article XIV (2) Conference later this year to secure the earliest possible entry into force of that Treaty.

Negotiation of the CTBT, with both its strengths and weaknesses, following closely upon the conclusion of the Chemical Weapons Convention, as

(Mr. Moher, Canada)

well as the 1995 agreement to initiate negotiation of a fissile materials cut-off treaty, was indeed a high point for the CD. It provided tangible evidence of what this body can achieve when circumstances allow, but even more so when the requisite political will exists. That perception is worth emphasizing - we should always bear in mind that political will can influence circumstances; we should never let circumstances dictate our fate! If we want to act, we can. Refusal, however articulated, to move forward on the basis of "slippery slope" fears or alleged "national security" grounds needs to be forcefully challenged. And definitely in a forum where each of us controls consensus!

This is what seems to be happening now - an inability to proceed with further substantive work due to a lack of will or, perhaps, to calculations that sincere efforts to advance disarmament should be hostage to events elsewhere. This is the frustrating aspect of my assignment here. It is that frustration, shared widely I am sure, that should lead us to recall and reaffirm the premises upon which and for which the CD exists. We should never give in to that frustration; surrender to failure should not be an option. I have never, for example, agreed with those who assert that our current stalemate is a confession of irrelevance by - or of the growing inutility of - the CD. But that situation, with its associated frustration, is a dramatic challenge to us all.

How to confront that challenge? From my perspective the basic premise upon which the CD is established is the conviction that measures to promote and achieve non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament are vital dimensions of a complex and comprehensive effort to enhance international security between sovereign States and to secure human security for all. They are not abstract - or even worse, naive - ends in themselves but critical elements as we strive to attain those security objectives. Neither international security between States nor human security can ever be secured by the overwhelming superiority of arms in the hands of some or by the unending acquisition of ever more exotic capabilities and/or of excessive quantities of weapons. Thucydides wrote many centuries ago: "They that have odds of power exact as much as they can, and the weak yield to such conditions as they can get." This is not a formula for true security, and especially not now as we enter a new millennium in which rapid and widespread advances in technology make us all increasingly vulnerable. Security for one and all remains a common goal demanding shared efforts. "Co-responsibility, cooperation and co-action" should be our mantra in the CD.

And there are positive actions we can take. Over the past four years the CD has shown considerable courtesy as Canada has set out its detailed reflections in that respect. There is no need to review that ground again today. But as I reflected in recent days upon our current stalemate a series of questions has emerged in my mind.

First, nuclear disarmament. Is nuclear disarmament not still a global priority in which all members of the international community have abiding interests? How can that global priority and those abiding interests of all be reflected in a positive, constructive and realistic way? Is substantive

(Mr. Moher, Canada)

discussion in the CD not one such way? Certainly denial of dialogue or mere talks-about-talks cannot suffice. Nor can manipulated diversions into make-work activities. What legitimate reservations exist against such discussion, and can they not be validly addressed? I recently had the opportunity at a Monterey Institute seminar in Divonne to review this ground with a number of CD members. I continue to believe sincerely that these questions can and should be positively addressed.

Second, fissile material production. Why has it been so difficult to begin work on this issue on the basis of the framework and mandate agreed four years ago? Does the negotiation process of the CD not provide us all with appropriate and sufficient means to protect our interests and to address our various concerns? Can widespread contextual considerations not be productively dealt with through a broader action programme carried out by the States concerned? Again my answers to these questions are affirmative; our intervention in March expanded on that perspective.

Third, non-weaponization of outer space. Does the prospective - and indeed increasingly likely - weaponization of outer space not affect the vulnerability of, and thus the security of, all States? Is our understanding that no country's current policies favour the weaponization (as contrasted to the military use) of outer space correct? If so, should we not enhance security for all by acting now to preclude such developments rather than waiting for political-military-technological-industrial constituencies with vested interests to emerge? Can we not move forward with focused negotiations to that end? There is no question but that vested interests are beginning to emerge; certainly more and more resources are being allocated to develop capabilities. We should not be satisfied with the soothing argument that our alarms are overstated since a classical "arms race" will not take place. The reality is that any State which considers its security at risk will inevitably respond in some fashion, quite likely setting back disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation efforts in other fields - and evoking and provoking even greater security concerns. Again, we can and should act.

And finally, conventional or small arms. Is there not a growing recognition of the security challenges and human suffering caused by small arms? Are actions not being taken at both the global and regional levels to respond to that recognition? Should not the CD also respond? The CD can also make a strategic contribution to global and regional efforts in this field. I hope new ideas and new initiatives to that end will come forward.

Now I apologize for having yet again addressed this august body through a series of questions! It is a failing of mine for which I have been frequently criticized. But it is a useful way to focus one's thinking. Essentially all of these questions converge into two basic challenges: what needs to be done by the CD to enhance international and human security? And how can we proceed to achieve that objective? These two basic challenges can be successfully overcome. And in doing so, we should avoid one more challenge, that is, why we should not address an issue. It is always possible to find excuses not to act. Certainly the argument that one should not proceed in a specific area because such action might preclude options in the

(Mr. Moher, Canada)

future should be forcefully rejected. If such an approach were ever to be adopted as a rule, would we ever have had any of our key agreements - the BTWC, the CWC, the CTBT? And would 182 non-nuclear-weapon States have adhered to the NPT itself, now extended indefinitely, thereby pledging indefinitely not to develop or acquire nuclear weapons? Canada has posed all of these questions to itself; our answers are included in our views as to a valid and viable programme of work in this body. The CD can respond: first, it should be a forum for the sophisticated and sustained consideration of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation issues, viz. nuclear disarmament; and, second, it should negotiate constructive multilateral agreements responding to our priority security needs.

To do so is certainly not beyond the capabilities of this Conference - capabilities which should furthermore be liberated from the straitjacket of our outmoded group structures. As the global community becomes more complex and multifaceted, I am increasingly of the view that issue groups are a much more constructive approach to our agenda. Are not the vast majority of this Conference in favour of positive realistic action on nuclear disarmament? If so, why do we not organize and act accordingly? It is frankly bizarre for us to continue into the next millennium on the basis that our security interests in this forum are effectively captured in "Western", "Eastern" and "G-21" groups. Differences of substance, of strategies, of tactics will always exist - but we should definitely demolish old barriers between us which are reflective of a world which no longer exists. And we should welcome additional members of our global community who wish to contribute directly to our work; certainly the unduly delayed decision to welcome our five new members - Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia - is particularly welcome.

This theme of drawing effectively upon the capabilities of the CD brings me to the most essential, and demanding, part of this goodbye message. As I disengage I wish to pay a sincere tribute to what is in the final analysis the greatest strength of the CD - that is, the quality of its members. It has been a singular experience and honour to have worked with so many worthy colleagues - ambassadors and advisers - and to have had the opportunity to appreciate their ability to advocate so effectively their perspectives and positions on the many demanding issues we have collectively addressed. Steve Ledogar, Grigori Berdennikov, Mounir Zahran, Jacob Selebi and Sha Zukang - all of whom made distinctive and lasting contributions - have moved on but are not forgotten. Arundhati Ghose deserves special mention for her remarkable grace and strength under fire. My "co-continental" Antonio de Icaza merits the deepest respect and admiration for his outstanding contributions. And the intellectual rigour, eloquence and energy demonstrated so consistently by Munir Akram over the past four years have been truly exceptional. Many others, past and present, could be mentioned, including in particular all my colleagues in the Western Group, with whom I and the Canadian team have worked so closely. I wish to emphasize it has been a great honour and pleasure to have worked with you all.

I also wish to express a special thank-you to our Secretary-General, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, and to his deputy, Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, as well as

(Mr. Moher, Canada)

to all members of our highly professional and impartial secretariat for their advice, their cooperation, and their support. Canada perhaps had a more thorough opportunity than many others to benefit therefrom during the lengthy CTBT process. Our appreciation is all the more sincere for that reason.

And, finally, it would be unconscionable of me not to acknowledge publicly in this plenary and on this occasion my deepest appreciation of the exceptional contributions made by my patient and forgiving Canadian partners. All of them - beginning with Don Sinclair and continuing with Avard Bishop, Mark Glauser and Marc Vidricaire - have consistently demonstrated the highest professional and personal qualities. My wholehearted respect and gratitude goes to them all.

And so my four years in this Conference come to an end. It has been a great honour for me to represent my country in this important institution. I have enjoyed immensely the professional challenges of "this graduate school of multilateral diplomacy". The exceptional personal relationships I have experienced have been equally rewarding. In finally closing I slightly paraphrase Otto von Bismarck, who stated: "The (diplomat's) task is to hear God's footsteps marching through history, and to try to catch on to His coat-tails as He marches past." May this Conference hear the footsteps - and catch on to the coat-tails! I wish this institution and you all individually the very best for the future.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Canada for his important statement. I am convinced that your words today will continue to assist this Conference to give thought to our work and that your words will be with us much longer than your physical presence in this room. But we will always remember you with great affection and much respect. I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand, Ambassador Clive Pearson.

Mr. PEARSON (New Zealand): Mr. President, since this is the first time I am taking the floor during your presidency, let me convey New Zealand's warm congratulations on your assuming the Chair. May I also convey my warm best wishes to Ambassador Moher and to his family for their future?

Mr. President, we support wholeheartedly your continuing efforts to reach a consensus on the programme of work. And we still hope this might prove possible this year, along with an understanding that it would also take us forward in 2000. While we appreciate, too, the desire to have a comprehensive programme, we are deeply disappointed that valuable time has been lost again this year: time that could have been spent productively on fissile materials negotiations.

New Zealand does not consider, as some are claiming, that the CD is in crisis over the failure to engage. But we may reach that point if there is continuing inaction beyond this year. It might be convenient for those who observe our activities to lay the blame for this situation at the feet of the institution itself. That would be illusory. The responsibility rests squarely with the members of this Conference.

(Mr. Pearson, New Zealand)

In this context, we do not support the call made recently by participants in the Tokyo Forum to "suspend" our operations until we can carry out purposeful work. To do so would be self-defeating and counter-productive.

New Zealand is committed to the legitimate role of this Conference as the multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament. And we do not dispute that it must negotiate by consensus. But the need to take a serious look at our working procedures is overdue and now compelling. And it may be those shortcomings that determine ultimately the credibility of the Conference in the future and our ability to engage in work.

We are delighted it was possible to take a decision last week to expand our membership. New Zealand was pleased to support the Special Coordinator's proposal from the outset. We are looking forward to working with these five delegations. New Zealand considers that membership of this body should be universal, however. It makes little sense to us, in a body charged with disarmament negotiations and where it is implicit that these instruments should enjoy universal adherence, not to ensure the widest possible participation in that process. We believe also that there can only be one criterion applied to membership of the Conference, and that is simply a commitment to disarmament: no more, no less.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of New Zealand for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil, Ambassador Celso Amorim.

Mr. AMORIM (Brazil): First of all, Mr. President, I want to join you in your farewell message to Ambassador Moher. His reflections today show to me, as a newcomer, what I have missed in the past and what all of us will be missing in the future.

I take the floor today to formally express the Brazilian Government's satisfaction at the decision which the Conference on Disarmament was able to adopt at its last session, under your able leadership, concerning the admission of five new members to its ranks, namely, Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia.

As a delegation committed to multilateralism in the field of disarmament and security issues, as well as in others, we welcome this decision as a very positive step, one which will contribute to making this forum more representative and more democratic and potentially more effective. We believe that the present international scenario can only benefit from an enhanced multilateral framework for the promotion of peace and security under the aegis of the United Nations, and in this context, a balanced enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament such as the one we have finally reached agreement on can be considered in itself an encouraging development.

(Mr. Amorim, Brazil)

We are convinced that the CD's five new members are particularly well placed to enrich our debates and impart new dynamism to our work with their firm commitment to peace within and beyond their regions, as well as with their strong engagement in the disarmament and international peace and security agenda of the United Nations.

As a Latin American, and in particular a South American, I wish to extend a fraternal greeting to the delegation of Ecuador, a country which presided over the General Assembly's First Committee a few years ago, a co-participant in the Tlatelolco Treaty regime, a nation which has recently set an historic example by peacefully settling a bilateral dispute within the strict observance of international law, thereby consolidating the pacific vocation of our region. Let me just say that I am particularly glad because when we had the last expansion of the CD, I had the opportunity to comment that there were only two Latin American members then being accepted and that our region was being penalized because it was peaceful. So it is being redressed now.

We share with all the new members a common historical perspective regarding the importance of raising the international level of awareness with respect to disarmament matters, and I believe it would be appropriate to underline that this remark applies very specifically to "nuclear disarmament".

Whether on a bilateral or plurilateral basis, we are pleased to be able to intensify our coordination with the five new CD members so as to advance towards the attainment of our shared objectives. We look forward to working closely with those among the five who now join the Group of 21. As a member of the "New agenda towards a nuclear-weapon-free world" coalition, we are proud to point out that with Ireland's admission to the CD, all members of this group are now full participants in the Conference.

Mr. President, I took the floor primarily to express these words of welcome to the new members. Nevertheless, like others, we feel distress at our incapacity to move forward in spite of the strenuous efforts of Presidents, including Ambassador Dembri and yourself, just to mention the last two. This inability is totally in contradiction to the professed aims of our countries and to the signal the peoples of the world are expecting from us on the eve of the millennium. We may be fortunate that public opinion at large, although very aware of the importance of disarmament subjects, particularly those linked to nuclear disarmament, does not focus sufficiently on the activity or inactivity of this body. Otherwise, it would soon start questioning if it is appropriate to dedicate human and material resources for no apparent result. However, I am not pessimistic. This is not the first time the CD is undergoing a stalemate in its deliberations, and even though its "crisis" - you may choose another name - has its own characteristics, I do think that we will be able to get out of this one as well. We call on members which are still reluctant to show flexibility to reflect on the facts of this paralysis for our long-term objectives. The best welcome we could offer the new members would be to have a programme of work in which they would be able to engage, as I am sure they are eager to do.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Brazil for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba, Ambassador Carlos Amat Fores.

Mr. AMAT FORES (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Allow me first of all, Mr. President, to express my appreciation to you and the distinguished ambassadors who occupied the Chair before you during this session of the Conference on Disarmament for the valuable and constructive efforts which you have made with a view to arriving at a programme of work and extracting this forum from its current impasse. I personally urge you to continue with your efforts, in which you may count upon the firm support of the Cuban delegation, which, like all the members of this Conference, hopes that it will be able to fulfil its functions and objectives and meet the expectations of the international community, which is calling upon us to make urgent efforts to maintain international peace and security.

I requested the floor this morning to address the question of expansion of the Conference on Disarmament and, in particular, decision CD/1588 which was adopted during the last plenary session and which permitted the entry of five new members, namely Ecuador, Malaysia, Tunisia, Kazakhstan and Ireland.

On behalf of the Government of Cuba, and speaking personally, I would like to congratulate the distinguished ambassadors or representatives of those five States and request them, through you, to convey to their respective Governments our welcome and our best wishes for being able to work in a joint and constructive manner in this important multilateral forum. Allow me also to express the hope that this recently adopted decision will constitute a spur to promote the work of the Conference on Disarmament and afford us a real opportunity to share with the five new members the arduous work which the international community expects of us in negotiating multilateral disarmament treaties with particular attention to the objective of achieving a world which is free of nuclear weapons.

I would like to add, in a concise manner, the hopes of my delegation with respect to the handling of the question of the expansion of membership in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. Cuba is prepared to accept and would welcome the appointment of a special coordinator on this issue, within the framework of a complete and balanced programme of work including the various existing priorities to be found on the international disarmament agenda. In our view, the mandate of such a special coordinator should not be confined to simply studying whether or not to increase the members of the Conference, but should also include a serious and thorough process of consultations and analysis making it possible to arrive at substantiated conclusions with respect to questions such as the present membership of the CD and whether the Conference really responds to the present requirements and scenarios with respect to international disarmament and security; whether the Conference is really characterized by equitable and representative geographical distribution between the various regional groups making it up, as well as internally within those groups; and provide for the possibility of exploring ways and means of conducting an objective appraisal of what might really constitute the optimum composition of the Conference, bearing in mind

(Mr. Amat Fores, Cuba)

its eminently negotiating role. Notable on this last point would be the necessary considerations among the criteria for access to membership of the CD and the need to ensure its effective functioning, issues on which my country is currently conducting a careful study.

Finally, allow me to reiterate words of welcome to the five States which have just become full members of the Conference on Disarmament and our willingness to establish close working and cooperative relations with all of them. Their presence in the Conference will undoubtedly be very positive and we are also sure that their analyses and thinking will contribute to enriching the debate and attaining the objectives of this multilateral negotiating forum.

I would like to endorse the words of appreciation and good wishes that other colleagues have spoken here by way of bidding farewell to Ambassador Moher of Canada. Ambassador Moher has undoubtedly left an important mark on the Conference on Disarmament and his deliberation and intelligence have more than once offered food for thought and a basis for positive steps forward. We wish the Ambassador and his family every happiness.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Cuba for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Finland, Ambassador Markku Reimaa.

Mr. REIMAA (Finland): On behalf of the 15 member States of the European Union, I have the honour to bring to the attention of the Conference the following observations.

The member States of the European Union have participated in the consensus on a limited expansion, comprising five new members, following the recommendation made by the Special Coordinator for CD expansion, the distinguished Ambassador Hofer of Switzerland, in his report last year. As the Special Coordinator set out in this report, the list of countries had been chosen by him in accordance with criteria relating to the date of application and to geographical distribution.

The European Union welcomes the decision of last week as a step forward in the ongoing process of CD expansion. We are looking forward to closely cooperating with the new members, Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia, to move the CD to substantive work.

However, the European Union notes that among the five new members of the CD, there is only one member State of the European Union. The decision taken last week therefore implies that, after decision CD/1406 of 17 June 1996, once again the declared objectives of the European Union have not been attained. I would like to recall that the European Union continues to pursue its efforts in support of the candidature to the CD of those European Union member States which are not yet members of the Conference. We would therefore like to state that such a limited expansion falls short of our expectations and runs counter to our well-known and traditional position.

(Mr. Reimaa, Finland)

In this respect, it is important to note that the CD does not organize its work on the basis of geographical groups in the sense that they exist, for instance, in specific United Nations forums. In this context, the EU does not consider geographical balance to be an essential criterion.

In accordance with rule 2 of the rules of procedure of the CD of June 1997, which stipulates that "the membership of the Conference will be reviewed at regular intervals", Finland would like to put on record on behalf of the member States of the European Union that the decision on a limited expansion adopted last week has been accepted by the EU States members of the CD as an intermediate step in the ongoing process of phased CD expansion to all candidates and with the explicit understanding that the CD remains actively seized of this matter. The European Union will therefore lend its full support to the early reappointment of a special coordinator on CD expansion. The European Union will itself continue to work actively with the special coordinator towards the achievement of its objectives in this context.

Before closing, let me wish Ambassador Moher and his family all the best and thank him for the excellent cooperation.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Finland for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Japan, Ambassador Akira Hayashi.

Mr. HAYASHI (Japan): Mr. President, since this is the first time for me to take the floor under your presidency, please allow me to express my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. I pledge the fullest cooperation and support of my delegation in the discharge of your important task. I also wish to express my sincere appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Dembri of Algeria, for his earnest and tireless efforts in achieving agreement on the programme of work for this year.

I would like to join the previous speakers in very warmly welcoming the five new members to the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation is looking forward to working together with these five new members. I would like also to extend my sincere best wishes to Ambassador Mark Moher, who will leave us very soon.

I have asked for the floor today in order to inform the CD members of the report of the Tokyo Forum for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, which was issued on 27 July.

The Tokyo Forum was originally proposed by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Ryutaro Hashimoto, and the then Foreign Minister and current Prime Minister, Mr. Keizo Obuchi, in August 1998, bearing in mind various challenges, both regional and global, which we face today in the promotion of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, especially the nuclear testing in South Asia.

(Mr. Hayashi, Japan)

The idea was to form a group in which eminent experts would study ways and means of countering the negative trends in nuclear non-proliferation and accelerating the nuclear disarmament process, and, based on that study, make concrete recommendations.

This undertaking was entrusted to two Japanese independent institutes, which have the expertise to conduct studies on disarmament, namely, the Japan Institute of International Affairs and the Hiroshima Peace Institute, to set up a body for that purpose. Their role and work as secretariat was supported by the Government of Japan.

More than 20 prominent experts from around the world participated in this exercise in their own personal capacities. Thus, the views expressed by the members do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Governments or organizations to which they belong.

They met four times and as a result produced this report at the last meeting which was held in Tokyo last month.

It should be noted that the members agreed to the main thrust of the report, but did not subscribe to every point in the report.

The report and recommendations are based on members' analysis of recent developments and their shared concern over the urgent need for concrete steps to be taken in order to stop the worrisome trends in regional and global security.

The report was submitted to Prime Minister Obuchi by the co-Chairmen of the Forum, former Ambassador Nobuo Matsunaga and former United Nations Under-Secretary-General Mr. Yasushi Akashi.

Even though the Government of Japan played only a limited role in supporting the organization of the meetings and the views expressed in the report do not necessarily reflect its position, our Government regards the report and the recommendations contained therein as significant contributions to the discussions on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation by the international community.

The Japanese Government, taking this report into consideration, intends to continue playing a key role in nuclear disarmament with a view to achieving a world free of nuclear weapons.

I would like to inform CD members that the report was also submitted by the co-Chairmen to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kofi Annan, on 4 August in New York. Accordingly, his spokesman issued a statement which expresses appreciation of the recommendations and the hope that the international community will study them with a view to reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons in the world.

(Mr. Hayashi, Japan)

The work of the Tokyo Forum has been concluded. The Japanese Government sincerely hopes that the Tokyo Forum report will be further considered and studied at various levels in the international community as a road map of how disarmament and non-proliferation issues can be pursued.

I have asked the Secretary-General of the CD, Mr. Petrovsky, to issue the text of the Tokyo Forum report as an official document of the CD. The full text of the report is also available on the home page of our mission (http://missions.itu.int/~japancd/).

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Japan for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa, Mr. Tom Markram.

Mr. MARKRAM (South Africa): I have requested the floor today to warmly welcome Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia as members of the Conference on Disarmament. South Africa has excellent relations with these countries and looks forward to working together with them in the CD in the pursuit of our common objectives.

My delegation would also like to extend its thanks and congratulations to Ambassador Hofer of Switzerland, who, in his capacity as Special Coordinator on the issue of expansion, was able to identify and consolidate the elements of this agreement. The efforts of each of the successive Presidents during 1999 must also be recognized. Without their commitment this issue may well have fallen victim to the paralysis which has affected the rest of our work this year. You, Mr. President, and your predecessors are to be congratulated for your energy and commitment to seeing our five new colleagues enter the fold.

The decision to expand the membership of the Conference is of course one which my delegation has consistently supported. Since our own entry to this body along with 22 other countries in 1996, South Africa has made clear its commitment to the democratization of all multilateral forums, including the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation will continue to work for the further expansion of the membership of the Conference. It is my Government's stated policy that every country which wishes to make a contribution to our important work should have an opportunity to do so. South Africa does not believe that the size of the membership of the Conference will have any significant effect on its ability to deliver the agreements to which it is mandated. The key element in the delivery of agreement is political will and that is a commodity which all new members of the Conference who have joined since 1996 have displayed in abundance.

We should not attempt to obfuscate the real issue by artificially tying the further expansion of the Conference to the successful conclusion of specific issues, rather we should focus on the real obstacles faced by the Conference, solve those in a considered and rational manner, and get down to work on the negotiations we all agree are our priority.

(Mr. Markram, South Africa)

Before I conclude, I would like to join others in wishing Ambassador Moher well in his new assignment. Ambassador Moher's intellectual and substantive contribution to the work of the CD, as well as his friendship, will be sorely missed.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of South Africa for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh, Ambassador Chowdhury.

Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh): Mr. President, your conduct of the leadership of the Conference on Disarmament is to be applauded, and we do so with much pleasure. We are also in the debt of your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Dembri, for his endeavours. Like others, we are sorry to see Ambassador Mark Moher go and wish him and his wife Jean our very best for the future.

The primary reason I take the floor is to welcome our five new members: Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia. Given that Bangladesh has excellent bilateral relations with each of those countries, a fact that is reflected in the close cooperation between us and each of them in Geneva, it gives us satisfaction beyond measure. We congratulate them. Furthermore, we express the confidence that their participation will not only enrich our deliberations, but also help lead this sole negotiating forum on disarmament closer to its goals. Ambassador Hofer and you yourself deserve praise for your efforts.

For now, though, the attainment of our aim in the Conference on Disarmament appears to be a prospect somewhat remote. In fact, it grows dimmer by the day. It is sad that we have reached an impasse, and the Gordian knot is unlikely to be untied soon. Our pace of progress would hearten the snail. Inaction in the Conference on Disarmament can send inappropriate signals to the rest of the world. This is particularly so at a time of deteriorating situations in many parts of the globe. Obviously a thrust forward would be necessary. The proposed Foreign Ministers' meeting early next year could be an event that could act as a spur. As ample evidence has clearly attested, unless there are definitive demonstrations of nuclear disarmament, both in terms of genuine efforts and actual effect, the purposes of non-proliferation can be seriously impeded. The key States have the additional responsibility of leading the way so that others who are less militarily powerful do not feel a perceived need to buttress their sense of security by means that could be seriously destabilizing. This is an area where the old and wise adage "example is better than precept" is most apt. If nuclear disarmament is being negotiated elsewhere, it is indeed welcome; but unless this representative forum of the global community is closely associated with ongoing processes through the appropriate framework, the end to which those efforts are directed, a more secure world, would be ill-served. A moral behavioural corollary to the acquisition of superior military technology must be greater restraint. By moving forward the Conference on Disarmament can also assist in containing individual situations, so that regional flashpoints

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

or flare-ups do not transform into conflagrations with wider ramifications. Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina and her Government are unflinchingly committed to Bangladesh striving for a stable and peaceful South Asia.

However, it is obvious that like you, Mr. President, your immediate successors, a category which also includes me, have their work cut out for them, but in this Bangladesh's active cooperation will always be forthcoming.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Bangladesh for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Turkey, Ms. Say.

Ms. SAY (Turkey): Mr. President, since my delegation is taking the floor for the first time, I would like to express, on behalf of my Ambassador and our delegation, our sincere congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference and assure you of the full support and cooperation of the Turkish delegation.

I have asked for the floor today to also welcome the five new members of the Conference. The decision that was taken during the last week's plenary has been keenly supported by our delegation. We are confident that the newly added five countries, with which Turkey enjoys excellent relations, would contribute effectively to the work of the Conference. Turkey is looking forward to working constructively with them. I also would like to express our appreciation to Ambassador Hofer of Switzerland for his tireless efforts as Special Coordinator on the matter.

On this occasion, I would like to reiterate my country's position regarding the future expansion of the CD. In our view, two assumptions should be borne in mind. Firstly, the CD should remain a body whose function is to negotiate arms control and disarmament, where the rule of consensus should apply. Secondly, it should be of limited composition and reflect the various political, economic and geographical elements commonly accepted in the international system. Now, we think that the time is ripe for the CD as the single multinational forum on disarmament to meet the expectations of the international community with its new composition.

I also would like to take this opportunity to bid farewell to the distinguished Ambassador Mark Moher on behalf of our delegation and my Ambassador, who unfortunately is not here today due to other engagements which prevented him from extending his best wishes to Ambassador Moher personally. We wish him and his family every happiness and success in the future.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Turkey for her statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Slovenia, Ambassador Zore.

Mr. ZORE (Slovenia): Sir, let me first salute you as the President of the Conference on Disarmament and congratulate you upon your assumption of

(Mr. Zore, Slovenia)

this responsible function, while sincerely hoping that your experience and untiring energy will help you lead the Conference towards agreement on its programme of work, even at this late stage of this year's session.

Allow me also to express my satisfaction at the fact that the Conference last week decided to expand its membership by five countries. My delegation interprets this as a hopeful sign that the CD could be moving toward the universalization of its membership, thus allowing those countries that wish to do so to participate in its deliberations. My sincere congratulations to the esteemed representatives of Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia.

The main reason for my taking the floor today is a short announcement. Allow me to make it known to the members and observers of the CD that on 29 July of this year the National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. This ratification is a clear manifestation of Slovenia's consistent policy of strengthening international arrangements and regimes for both the prevention of nuclear proliferation as well as the continuation of the process of nuclear disarmament.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Slovenia for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mr. Naziri Asl.

Mr. NAZIRI ASL (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I would like to begin, on behalf of my delegation and my Ambassador, by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. I should like to express my delegation's sincere appreciation to your predecessor for his untiring efforts.

Last week we took the decision to admit five new members to the Conference on Disarmament. We warmly welcome Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia as full members of the Conference on Disarmament. We are ready to cooperate with the new members in the work ahead.

I took the floor to emphasize once again our position on the issue of expansion. As we have already addressed this issue, we understand the rationale of universality, but one should not lose sight of the fact that there is a close correlation between the expansion of the Conference and its efficiency. The Conference on Disarmament needs to be a negotiating body, and as such, it should be meaningful and be able to perform its functions effectively so as to live up to the expectations of the world community. As for the future, the issues of expansion and efficiency need to be seen together and be revisited in the light of the careful assessment of the impact of the previous extension on the efficiency of the Conference. In any event, transparency in the decision-making process on this issue is an absolute necessity. Furthermore, any future proposal for expansion must be fitted within the general policy of expansion as opposed to a piecemeal approach.

THE PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his statement and the words addressed to the Chair. This concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? If not, I should like to share with you a number of thoughts before adjourning this meeting, as we come very close to the end of Argentina's term as President of the Conference on Disarmament.

During these eight weeks, four weeks of meetings and four making up an inter-sessional period, I and my delegation held meetings and consultations with a view to securing agreement on the programme of work and on the proposal for expansion of the Conference. Informally, we considered with various players within the Conference alternative ways of finding solutions to the problems which we faced. We expressed our views and we listened to their ideas, in an atmosphere where the greatest understanding and goodwill in the search for common values always prevailed. We did not confine ourselves to what could be done here in Geneva, and we mobilized some of our representatives in various capitals to convey to the Governments concerned the ideas and the requirements, not simply of the President but of the Conference itself. At the conclusion of these weeks we have a clear view of where we stand with respect to the programme of work.

At the same time the Conference was able to resolve the question of admitting the five new members identified in the report of the Special Coordinator, Ambassador Erwin Hofer, of Switzerland. With respect to the expansion of the Conference, I would once again like to welcome the five delegations that are joining in our common efforts - Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia. I would also like to thank Ambassador Hofer for the good job of work he performed and Ambassador Grey, of the United States, for presenting the draft which made the adoption of that decision possible. In particular, my thanks go to those delegations which were able to overcome the difficulties they had on this question, and which, in a gesture which was very much appreciated by the Chair, made it possible to arrive at the necessary consensus. Despite the fact that we have taken a step forward, however, we should not forget that the decision which we have adopted specifically permitted the admission of five new members, without prejudice to the consideration of earlier, current and future requests. The Conference still has before it for consideration requests by 21 other countries. Of those 21 requests, the request of longest standing was submitted almost 15 years ago, and the most recent four months ago. As rule 2 of its rules of procedure provides, and as recalled by many delegations this morning, the Conference must consider its membership at regular intervals. I consider that this issue should be one of the elements of the future programme of work.

If I may I would now like to make a number of comments concerning the substance of our activities in the Conference. In our view, the outline of a future programme of work should include the following:

The re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate, on the basis of the report by the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty on the prohibition of the production of fissile

(The President)

material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices. The need to reappoint this negotiating committee was noted by the earlier Presidents of the Conference, Ambassador Grey of the United States and Ambassador Rodríguez Cedeño of Venezuela, in draft decisions CD/1566 and CD/1575; by the countries in the G21 in their draft CD/1570; and by the United States, France and the United Kingdom in their document CD/1586. Furthermore, it was emphasized in resolution 53/77 I of the United Nations General Assembly;

The re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement on international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The re-establishment of this Committee was likewise proposed in all the Conference documents I have just mentioned;

The reappointment of a special coordinator entrusted with the task of seeking the views of the members of the Conference on the most appropriate way of addressing questions related to anti-personnel mines, bearing in mind inter alia events taking place outside the Conference;

The reappointment of a special coordinator for the item "Transparency in armaments", in order that the views of the members of the Conference should be sought on the most appropriate means of addressing this question;

The reappointment of special coordinators to consider the agenda of the Conference, the expansion of its membership and the means of making its functioning more effective.

During the consultations I was also able to observe a growing predisposition towards the possibility of continuing the work of the Conference during the next annual session on the basis of a balanced and comprehensive programme of work which might be agreed this year. Since three weeks of the last part of the session have already gone by, only two or three more weeks at the most remain before the Conference must begin its consideration of the report it will present to the United Nations General Assembly. I have no illusions about the quantity of substantive work which can be performed this year, even were we to approve the programme of work immediately. If a consensus is reached in the weeks ahead on the programme of work, it is my impression that the programme should be accompanied by an agreement among the members of the Conference whereby the work commenced on the basis of that programme could be resumed at the start of the next session and continue throughout the year 2000. That "goodwill agreement" should be formalized in a Presidential declaration and should be implemented in full compliance with the Conference's rules of procedure.

Turning to the other two items which would make up a comprehensive and balanced programme of work, that is to say nuclear disarmament and prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS), at the end of my term of office both are still awaiting a decision. Although the Conference has not yet found the way to address these two questions, we can already identify the main elements which would enable us to pursue compromises in these two areas. Allow me to

(The President)

remind you that throughout our work, and currently with respect to PAROS and nuclear disarmament in particular, the will of Governments is fundamental. Without the necessary political will, the Conference will not be able to continue to advance towards the attainment of its noble objectives and this situation, which I would not want to describe as a crisis, but rather as a circumstantial impasse, is no help to any of the countries which go to make up this Conference and I am sure it will be no help to the work of the Conference itself either. In both respects I consider that the proposals informally presented by the previous President of the Conference, Ambassador Mohamed-Salah Dembri, of Algeria, and the comments which have been made on them, afford an excellent basis to enable my successor, Ambassador Leslie Luck, of Australia, to continue the search for solutions in a spirit of compromise. I think that we should continue to do our utmost so that at the start of the meetings in the year 2000 the Conference can build on the basis of what has been agreed this year.

I would like to convey to Ambassador Luck my hope that progress can be made during his term of office, and to assure him that he may count upon the support of the Argentine delegation in all his activities. Allow me also to express my thanks to the coordinators of the regional groups, Ambassador Kunadi of the G21, Ambassador Siebert of the Western Group, Mr. Mikhnevich of the Eastern European Group and Ambassador Li of China. All of you gave me your support and your good wishes for making as much headway as was possible during my term. I must also thank the Secretary-General, Vladimir Petrovsky, and the Deputy Secretary-General, Abdelkader Bensmail, for all the support they have provided; and all the members of the secretariat and the interpreters, whose very efficient work makes an important contribution to our activities. And finally, my thanks to all of you, esteemed colleagues, for your patience, your understanding and your cooperation.

This concludes our work for today. The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 19 August 1999 at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.833
19 August 1999

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 19 August 1999, at 10.20 a.m.

President: Mr. Leslie Luck (Australia)

GE.99-65543 (E)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 833rd plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. At the outset, could I, on behalf of the Conference's full membership, express our sincere condolences to the Government and the people of Turkey for the tragic earthquake that occurred earlier this week.

I have on the list of speakers for today the representative of Pakistan. However, before giving the floor to that speaker, I should like to make some brief opening remarks as Australia assumes the presidency of the Conference.

It is a great honour for me, on behalf of Australia, to assume the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. I feel fortunate to have inherited the fruits of the unstinting efforts and the skills of my several predecessors in the presidency, and I would like to pay tribute to their achievements in conducting our work through what has been a challenging year so far. I should also like to take the opportunity to thank the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, and his deputy, Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, and their staff, for their valuable advice and support.

In the role of President of the Conference, I consider that my primary responsibility is to carry forward the efforts of my predecessors to reach an agreement on a programme of work and in doing that, I will spare no effort. While I will make every attempt to faithfully represent the collective wishes of the Conference, my instinct, as an Australian President, will be to push for closure on the issues which we sense are within our grasp. I believe that there exists amongst us a general sense of goodwill and a widespread desire to reach agreement on a programme of work, if at all possible. But realistically, our time now is quite limited. The political will which is so necessary to our future work would best be demonstrated in these coming days. As my predecessor the distinguished Ambassador of Argentina concluded, there appears to be agreement on most of the elements of a comprehensive programme of work. It is essentially in two areas, PAROS and nuclear disarmament, where remaining differences prevent progress across other areas of our agenda. I believe that the spirit and common sense of purpose within this Conference would benefit greatly if we were able simply to find a way to get down to work on the basis of an agreed programme.

We all know each other's arguments well and the underlying positions which they represent. We now need to take collective responsibility and expend the goodwill necessary to narrow the current differences in our positions. This will entail a readiness to make some further compromise on the part of us all.

My other key responsibility as President is to facilitate the preparation of the Conference's annual report to the United Nations General Assembly. As you are aware, rule 44 of the Conference's rules of procedure provides that the draft report shall be made available to all members of the Conference at least two weeks before the scheduled date of its adoption. Accordingly, the draft annual report, as contained in document CD/WP.503, will be available in delegations' pigeon-holes, in all

(The President)

official languages, on Tuesday, 24 August. On Thursday, 26 August, an informal plenary meeting will be held immediately following the regular plenary meeting in order to start consideration of the draft annual report. My approach to this task will be, I hope, practical and realistic, and I would urge all delegations to take my lead on this. My motivation for this, aside from the requirement in the rules of procedure that the report must be factual in nature, is this: we find ourselves with a report to write and yet work is still to be done. In my view, these two tasks should not detract from each other. Indeed, if we can successfully direct our energies towards reaching an agreement on the programme of work, then this will in turn facilitate our task of writing the report. I should make clear that even as we commence work on the preparation of our annual report, it is my intention to continue consultations on the programme of work for as long as hope remains for an agreement.

As I tackle the two major and immediate responsibilities of the presidency during this period, I will be mindful of the expectation that I will work with delegations to help create conditions for an expeditious start to the Conference's work in the year 2000. I will look to my colleagues here for guidance and assistance in that task in the weeks ahead.

Many of you have already assured me of your full cooperation in taking forward our work over the period ahead. I sincerely thank you for those assurances and look forward to the cooperation of all delegations in ensuring that the report-writing process and the presentation of the report to the General Assembly is achieved smoothly.

With those remarks, I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan. Ambassador Akram, you have the floor.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): First of all, Mr. President, it is my pleasant duty and pleasure to express the felicitations of the Pakistan delegation to you on assuming the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament at this critical, if not a crisis, situation for our Conference. I am confident that with your diligence, skill, and no doubt, your luck, you will succeed in doing what your predecessors unfortunately attempted with great valour but were found a little short of that magic that has to emerge.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to all your predecessors, and in particular your immediate predecessor, our dear friend Ambassador González of Argentina, who not only moved forward the process of consultations and the so-called "Dembri proposals" but also succeeded in the task of expanding the Conference on Disarmament, and it is my pleasant duty to welcome both our new colleagues as well as the new members of the Conference on Disarmament today once again.

On a more sombre note, I would wish to express the deep condolences of the Government and the people of Pakistan to our brothers and sisters in Turkey for the great devastation which has been visited upon that country in

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

the earthquake which happened in the last two days. We hope and trust that the international community will provide all possible help to Turkey in overcoming this great disaster.

The year 1999 has not been a good year for disarmament. It has in particular not been a good year for the Conference on Disarmament. In our previous meetings, my delegation has had the opportunity to critically examine the nuclear doctrines of certain Powers and alliances which have impinged on the very basis of nuclear disarmament and nuclear restraint which is necessary for the promotion of the goals of nuclear disarmament and arms control in this body. Unfortunately, these negative developments have not been restricted to those major Powers. Today we are obliged to take note of the most serious development, which is the issuance of "India's nuclear doctrine", as recommended by its National Security Advisory Board, which indicates that India is about to embark on a further and even more dangerous escalation in the nuclear and conventional arms build-up. This recommended "doctrine" has been put forward as an articulation of the concept of so-called "credible minimum nuclear deterrence", which was propounded by the distinguished Prime Minister of India after India's nuclear tests last May. The recommended doctrine confirms India's craving to be recognized as a global Power - not by acting as a "responsible" member of the international community but through nuclear and conventional militarization and aggressive actions.

India has declared that it will establish "sufficient, survivable and operationally prepared nuclear forces". Thus, despite the best endeavours made by Pakistan for strategic restraint, India is likely to go ahead with the deployment and operationalization of its nuclear weapons and delivery systems. The India "doctrine" would negate several measures for mutual restraint which were identified in the Memorandum of Understanding signed by Pakistan and India at the Lahore summit. It would frustrate the central purpose of the "Strategic Restraint Regime" proposed by Pakistan to India at the last round of talks (under the item on "Peace and security").

Moreover, the declaration of the proposed "doctrine" by the BJP "caretaker" Government calls into question the alleged achievements of the eight rounds of the Jaswant Singh-Talbot talks and the assurances given to Pakistan, and the international community, that India will accept some form of restraints, particularly with regard to the deployment and operationalization of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. It is now evident that such assurances were the result of false promises by India or were falsely propagated to persuade Pakistan to accept one-sided commitments. Pakistan will closely follow the reactions of the major Powers to this latest intended escalation. The only hope which one major Power expressed yesterday is that India will sign the CTBT. Important as the CTBT is, its signature is hardly relevant to the scope and magnitude of the instability and danger which India will provoke by the operational deployment of the inordinately large nuclear arsenal which it envisages. It has said that it possesses the capability to develop neutron bombs. It said it will continue an R & D programme, including so-called "subcritical tests" to further develop its nuclear weapons designs. It has also embarked on various other forms of militarization.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

Neither Pakistan nor the international community can be taken in by India's so-called "no first use" policy. "No first use" has never been accepted as the basis for determining the deterrent postures of any of the nuclear-weapon States. Indeed, India itself places no credibility in "no first use". If it did, it should have accepted China's assurance of "no first use" and of the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. This would have obviated the need for India's nuclear weapons acquisition, and it would have made it unnecessary to even envisage the operational deployment of such nuclear weapons. Non-deployment, in turn, would make "no first use" declarations unnecessary.

India's "no first use" declaration is, in fact, designed to secure for itself "recognition" as a nuclear-weapon State, which would flow from the "acceptance" of its "no first use" and non-use "assurances". It is for this purpose that India has offered to ratify the non-use assurance protocol to the Treaty establishing the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone.

Secondly, India will seek to justify the acquisition of a large nuclear arsenal by arguing that its nuclear forces should be large enough to sustain and retaliate against a nuclear first strike. The document issued yesterday states that "nuclear weapons shall be designed and deployed to ensure survival against a first strike and to endure repetitive attrition attempts with adequate retaliatory capabilities". The Indian "doctrine" envisages a triad of nuclear forces, land-based, air-based and sea-based. This will be a huge arsenal.

A study which has recently been issued in the United States estimates that India possesses 1,600 kilograms of fissile materials, which would give it the capability to develop over 400 nuclear warheads. This estimate and the Indian nuclear doctrine which has just been propounded will have to be taken into account by Pakistan and by all those countries which are likely to be threatened by India's nuclear-weapons arsenal.

The proposed Indian "doctrine" also makes it clear that India's nuclear escalation will be accompanied by the further build-up of India's conventional warfare capabilities. The document says that a highly effective conventional military capability will be proposed. Since the vast majority of India's conventional "assets" are deployed against Pakistan, it will be obliged to respond to the Indian build-up. Moreover, the growing imbalance in conventional military capabilities will intensify Pakistan's reliance on its nuclear capabilities to deter the use or threat of aggression or domination by India. Thus, although the Indian document states that the purpose of a conventional arms build-up is to raise the nuclear threshold, in fact, the Indian conventional build-up will further lower the nuclear threshold and bring closer the danger of nuclear use in the subcontinent.

We are convinced that, following last year's nuclearization, the best option for Pakistan and India is to promote a strategic restraint regime envisaging mutual and reciprocal moderation in the nuclear, missile and conventional fields, and a serious endeavour to resolve underlying disputes, specially Jammu and Kashmir.

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

Pakistan has made specific proposals to India for this purpose. We have presented a detailed paper for a strategic restraint regime, and we are now calling for an immediate resumption of bilateral talks to address Kashmir and other issues between us. India has refused so far, posing conditions and preconditions for this purpose. We call on the international community to speak out against the Indian nuclear intentions, to arrest this danger and to reverse it, and help us in resolving the underlying problem of Kashmir, without which peace is unlikely to prevail in South Asia.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Pakistan for his statement and for the kind words addressed to me as Chair. I see that Turkey has asked for the floor. I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Turkey.

Ms. SAY (Turkey): Mr. President, allow me first of all to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency. I have asked for the floor today to express our thanks to the consuls and the delegations of brotherly participants for expressing their sympathy and condolences for the big disaster which has happened in my country. We shall definitely convey these messages to our Government. I should like to take this opportunity to express my country's appreciation and gratitude to those countries and international agencies who have immediately extended their helping hand to us at such a difficult time for my country.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of Turkey for her words, and I am very pleased to hear that you will convey our thoughts to your Government. The distinguished Ambassador of India is asking for the floor. You have the floor, Madam.

Ms. KUNADI (India): Mr. President, since this is the first time that my delegation is taking the floor under your presidency, allow me to convey to you our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency and our satisfaction at seeing you guide our proceedings with such skill. We would also like to place on record our appreciation for the diligent efforts put in by the previous President, the Ambassador of Argentina, who carried forward our work in the CD.

My delegation would also like to express our deep condolences to the Government and people of Turkey for the tragic earthquake which struck that country two days ago.

It was really not my intention to seek the floor today but I have been constrained to do so in view of certain unwarranted and possibly ill-informed comments which have been made about India's policy with regard to nuclear weapons by the Ambassador of Pakistan. These comments have no basis. The facts are that the National Security Advisory Board of the Government of India had made available a draft entitled "Indian nuclear doctrine" for purposes of

(Ms. Kunadi, India)

public discussion and debate, in keeping with our commitment as a responsible nuclear-weapon State. As you would expect from the largest democracy in the world, India is committed to greater transparency in decision-making. Such an open and transparent process may not be familiar to the delegation of Pakistan. There is no change in the Indian position on the doctrine of minimum credible deterrence and its elements, as stated in the CD and other forums in the past. Attempts by the delegation of Pakistan to drag this document into the deliberations of this Conference are unfortunate and are most certainly an unproductive use of the time of this Conference.

It was India's desire to establish peaceful and friendly and cooperative relations with Pakistan that led to our Prime Minister's historic initiative to visit Lahore, resulting in the Lahore Declaration, and it is Pakistan which has trampled upon the Lahore Declaration and betrayed trust. On our part, we have been making consistent efforts to improve relations with Pakistan so that countries can live in amity and peace.

On other occasions, my delegation has expressed its disappointment that the CD has not been able to commence substantive work on the basis of a comprehensive programme of work. Our sense of disappointment only deepens as we approach the final stage of this year's annual session. At a time when the Conference should be devoting all its energies to finding agreement on substantive aspects of work, distractions and digressions are something that the Conference can ill afford.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of India, Ambassador Kunadi, for her kind words and for her statement. The distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan has asked for the floor. You have the floor, Sir.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): I am, of course, quite inured to listening to the grossest inexactitudes from the delegation of our neighbour, but on this occasion, let me perhaps try and clarify the situation as Ambassador Kunadi has expressed it. As I understand it, the document issued yesterday by the National Security Advisory Board of the Government of India is an official document. It has been stated that this is an articulation of the policy of so-called "minimum credible nuclear deterrence" - whatever that may mean. The document was introduced by the Prime Minister's Security Adviser, and therefore, it carries with it the weight of that office and of the official nature of the institution which has issued it. I would be very happy if the distinguished representative of India were to denounce this document and to state that it does not in any way reflect Indian policy or Indian intentions in the nuclear field. I think that all of us in the CD would be very happy to hear such a denunciation or enunciation by the distinguished representative of India. Unfortunately, I did not hear that in her statement.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan for his further statement. That concludes my list of speakers for today. Is there any other delegation which wishes to take the floor this morning? I see none. That, therefore, concludes our business today.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 26 August, at 10 a.m., and I should like to remind you that after that meeting, we will reconvene in informal mode to commence our consideration of the draft annual report to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.834
26 August 1999

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 26 August 1999, at 10.20 a.m.

President: Mr. Leslie Luck (Australia)

GE.99-65709 (E)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 834th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

I should like, at the outset, to extend a very warm welcome to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala, whose presence among us again today testifies to his deep interest in our endeavours and to his support for our Conference.

As you are aware, two of our esteemed colleagues, Ambassador André Mernier of Belgium and Ambassador Frank Majoor of the Netherlands, will soon leave our Conference, having been called to other important responsibilities by their respective Governments. During their time here, they have presented and defended the positions of their Governments on issues under discussion at the Conference with an authority and diplomatic talent which I think we have all recognized. They also contributed to the common effort to narrow differences among delegations on the important issues before the Conference. I am sure that I speak on behalf of all of us when I express to Ambassador Majoor and to Ambassador Mernier, and to their families, our very best wishes for their continued success and their personal happiness in the future.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Chile, Belgium and the Netherlands. Before giving them the floor, however, I should like to remind you that immediately following this plenary meeting we shall hold an informal plenary meeting to start consideration of the draft annual report, as contained in document CD/WP.503. With those comments, I should now like to give the floor to the representative of Chile, Ambassador Javier Illanes.

Mr. ILLANES (Chile) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, as you have taken up your post as the new President of the Conference, I would like first of all to congratulate you and offer you our wholehearted cooperation in the discharge of your important responsibilities. I wish at the same time to express appreciation for and single out most particularly the successful efforts of your predecessor, Ambassador González, of Argentina, to secure the agreement on the expansion of the Conference, as well as his work and initiatives to gain approval for the programme of work of this negotiating forum on disarmament.

I also wish to express our appreciation for the excellent work carried out in this same regard by Ambassador Dembri of Algeria, who has left us, as a result of his remarkable endeavours and abilities, one of the texts which, although of an informal nature, seems to be closest to bringing together the wishes of the Conference. Lastly, I cannot fail to acknowledge the strenuous and dedicated efforts made throughout the present year by all the previous Presidents of the Conference to find formulas to allow us to initiate our substantive work. I also wish to associate myself with your words of farewell and good wishes to our distinguished colleagues from Belgium and Holland, who have played such an outstanding role in this Conference and who, regrettably for us, are now leaving. Allow me also to extend a welcome and express our sincere congratulations to the five new member countries who were recently admitted to the Conference on Disarmament. To all of them we offer our fullest support in their future work.

(Mr. Illanes, Chile)

The decision to expand the number of members has become the most important event which has taken place in this forum during the present year. It is at the same time a reflection of and a hope for the Conference's capacity to progress in the right direction in spite of the obvious difficulties which obstruct the reaching of agreements. The distance covered by the Conference on Disarmament to come to this decision illustrates graphically the extreme complexity and uncertainty of the process of seeking consensus and taking decisions.

Analysis of the phases through which, in the course of the present year, the successive Presidents of the Conference have had to discharge their difficult duties, even given the excellent cooperation on the part of the secretariat, confirms that in 1999 we face a situation of aggravated deadlock, within the tendency which has been displayed in this Conference since 1996, after the conclusion of the work on an instrument for the prohibition of nuclear tests.

In the post-cold-war world which emerged at the beginning of the present decade, the initial phase of optimism, cooperation and the adoption of major decisions in the field of world strategic policy has gradually been replaced by another in which narrow individual and often intransigent considerations on the part of the various international actors tend to prevail. This has generated a global strategic situation of increased insecurity and instability which is undermining earlier efforts towards non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and would seem to be fostering a discouraging tendency towards rearmament and proliferation. This is due to the existence of numerous political difficulties of various kinds which are in evidence today in the strategic and international security field. It seems obvious that, at present, the world urgently needs to re-establish a climate of trust and cooperation in the process of reduction and control of weapons of mass destruction, and principally nuclear weapons.

As mentioned in the recent report issued by the "Tokyo Forum", on nuclear dangers, whose content my delegation shares to a large extent, in order for this process to be possible, there is a need, in the first place, for the major nuclear Powers to solve their political differences, which constitute an important cause of the difficulties being encountered by the process of reducing nuclear weapons, including regional issues of security and proliferation. It is well known that this Forum brought together a group of distinguished disarmament experts of the highest level and standing, at the initiative of the Government of Japan. The group's review of the peace and security situation in the world in connection with national and multilateral efforts to achieve disarmament is most valuable. Although many may not agree with one aspect or another of its conclusions, the merit of their analysis as a whole is undeniable.

We are all aware of the various events in the recent past which have gradually weakened the fabric of international security and, in particular, caused cracks in the edifice of non-proliferation. The list is long and there is no point in repeating it. Suffice it to say that as a result of these events and of the persistence of narrow policies, the link between nuclear

(Mr. Illanes, Chile)

non-proliferation and the reduction of nuclear weapons, including the ultimate objective of achieving complete nuclear disarmament, has been weakened. In fact, at the turn of the twenty-first century, the momentum that had been generated by the end of the cold war to make a universal and effective global nuclear non-proliferation regime a reality is in danger of being lost. Additionally, other new risks of nuclear proliferation come from different directions, resulting from such varied factors as the absence of proper security measures to prevent the transfer of materials, technology or weapons across borders; the maintenance of clandestine programmes by member countries of the NPT or regional agreements; the possibility that terrorist groups may acquire access to ownership of nuclear technology and materials; the lower relative cost of and easier access to components for nuclear weapons; the military superiority of the conventional arms stockpiles of technologically advanced States, which may lead other States to revise their views as to the importance of weapons of mass destruction; and, in general, the fact that proliferation on the part of one State or region may trigger proliferation in others. It is obvious that these threats to non-proliferation need to be urgently addressed.

As stated in the above-mentioned Tokyo Forum report, we are all sufficiently aware of the disastrous and long-lasting consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. This was demonstrated to us by experiences of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, such as those suffered by the cities and that is why the abolition of these weapons of mass destruction constitutes the most important and long-cherished goal of the international community. However, since the release of the Canberra Commission report, in 1996, prospects for abolition have been weakened and the international community has reached a crossroads at which it must choose between the assured dangers of proliferation and the challenges of disarmament. Given this choice, there can be no standing still. My delegation shares the thinking of the Tokyo Forum when it states that progress towards nuclear disarmament is inextricably tied to success in non-proliferation efforts, so that without success in non-proliferation, the goal of zero nuclear weapons cannot be achieved. The consequence is that the central compact in the NPT between nuclear States and non-nuclear States, whereby the former committed themselves to nuclear disarmament and the latter renounced nuclear weapons, must be strengthened, the alternative being further proliferation and the continued revaluation of nuclear weapons in the twenty-first century.

During the preparatory process for the Conference to review the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), scheduled for the year 2000, we have seen with concern the increasing lack of political understanding between the parties - nuclear States and non-nuclear States - to the said Treaty as to how to progress in a manner which is effective and satisfactory for all the interested parties towards the securing of the ultimate objectives of the NPT. I consider it appropriate to mention on this occasion that in 1995, when the Government of Chile justified its accession to the NPT, just before the holding of the Review and Extension Conference for that Treaty, on which occasion the parties agreed to convert it into an instrument of unlimited duration, Chile did so in the conviction that the obligations and rights arising from it, for each and every one of the parties, constitute a genuine

(Mr. Illanes, Chile)

programme of action to reach the above-mentioned objectives, and with the idea that the international community was advancing resolutely towards the objective of non-proliferation and towards the achievement of the ultimate purpose of nuclear disarmament: the total abolition of nuclear weapons. But in no way did we seek to establish an international order based upon the perpetual existence of a small group of States with the right to possess nuclear weapons and a great majority without that right. Today we are deeply worried and disappointed at the course that the preparatory process for the Year 2000 NPT Review Conference has taken, which is essentially irrelevant to the objective of the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Among other important conclusions, the aforementioned Tokyo report stated that a fissile material cut-off treaty is a precondition for success in nuclear non-proliferation as well as a building block for nuclear disarmament, to the extent that it will help to curb nuclear proliferation and facilitate efforts to detect the clandestine acquisition and production of such types of weapon. Therefore, it calls on the Conference on Disarmament to act on the mandate on the negotiation of a convention on fissile material generated by the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference and to implement the Shannon decision adopted by the Conference that same year. That would make it possible to overcome the paralysis which delayed the establishment of an ad hoc negotiating committee until August 1998 and has frustrated its re-establishment in 1999. My delegation endorses this call. A core question in the nuclear disarmament debate is that of determining which of the two options - nuclear deterrence or the abolition of nuclear weapons - offers greater national, regional and global security. The States that possess nuclear weapons maintain that they enhance their national security. However, their actions may lead rival Powers to acquire nuclear weapons, leading to diminished security for both and, moreover, for their neighbours. This is a conclusion which is familiar to us but which many prefer to ignore: national, regional and global security are not enhanced by the possession of nuclear weapons. In the present circumstances it is therefore essential for all States to redouble their efforts in favour of non-proliferation and disarmament, and in this context special mention is to be made of the initiative of the Coalition for a New Agenda, which has given a new impetus to the forums which have got stuck in the controversy of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence versus that of the setting of a fixed framework of time for the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

The paragraphs which the Tokyo Forum devotes to the Conference on Disarmament are questionable. However, it is difficult not to appreciate the general importance which it assigns to the normalization of our work in order to attain the noble objective of disarmament. This leads us to refer to the issue of the deadlock which has been affecting the work of the CD for three years. This impasse disturbs us, although it has often been said that it is normal for the CD to have periods in which it can do no useful work because the conditions are not ripe for agreement in the international community and that this does not in fact impair its work because more positive moments will later come about in which progress can be made. This seemed to be true, particularly, during the cold war. Nevertheless, when the cold war ended it seemed logical to believe that an era was beginning in which, free from these

(Mr. Illanes, Chile)

cycles of enmity and suspicion, it would be possible to achieve important and sustained progress in all areas of disarmament, and particularly in the control and subsequent elimination of nuclear weapons. These hopes regrettably did not last long, and we see with concern that the process started timidly a few years ago is already deadlocked.

We are not so naïve as to think that the mere better handling of the work of the CD, which could be obtained through some reforms aimed at rationalizing its procedures, would in itself produce meaningful progress in the results of our work. It is evident that there is a correlation between the "productivity" of this body and the conditions of a degree of harmony or greater tension and mistrust among the great Powers and even among other actors in the international arena. Nevertheless, many delegations consider that, even in this highly unpromising current scene, the CD could emerge from its paralysis and approve a programme of work which would enable it to resume its activities. While attainment of this objective remains pending, the Chilean delegation wishes to refer to the possibility and desirability of laying down some operating arrangements of limited scope which, without altering the CD's current procedural framework, would enable it to carry out useful work to prepare the ground and facilitate the later initiation of possible negotiations on the various items on our agenda.

At the end of the CD's 1997 session, the Chilean delegation presented some ideas based on this philosophy. Later, in March 1998, I was appointed Special Coordinator for the item of the improved and effective functioning of the CD, and a year ago I had the honour to report to the Conference on the outcome of the consultations I had carried out on this topic. In those consultations various possibilities were explored, among which was one involving the establishment of certain more or less permanent committees or working groups, for each item of the agenda, on the understanding that their establishment would in no way imply an intention, still less a commitment, to initiate a negotiating process on a specific binding international instrument. The objective of their activities would be "to clarify national positions while seeking to promote convergences". The consultations to which I am referring with the CD delegations and observers were very interesting and a large number of comments were formulated. This idea in particular received ample support, but it also raised doubts among several delegations and even openly negative reactions. I will resist the temptation to detail these reactions because it would unduly prolong my statement and, above all, because the proposal which I am about to suggest today, while similar, is different from the 1997 proposal, and therefore does not have the same merits nor the same defects.

In the report presented to the Conference I spoke of the desirability of continuing the examination of these questions in 1999 and highlighted the general support given to the Presidential troika procedure and the unanimous importance the members of the Conference had attached to the intensification of the informal consultations carried out by the President, to facilitate progress in the work of the Conference. It is on the basis of that unanimous support for the Presidential consultations that the Chilean delegation now wishes to formulate the proposal that it should be the President of the

(Mr. Illanes, Chile)

Conference himself who should organize consultations on each item of the agenda, which would be in the nature of informal pre-negotiation discussions. The President could chair these discussions himself or entrust this task to "Friends of the Chair". They would be open-ended, without records or any kind of official documentation, and would be open to all delegations and observers in the CD. It could be argued that weekly informal consultations carried out by the President with the regional group coordinators already exist, but the difference lies in the fact that all countries would participate in the proposed consultations, thus enriching them with their ideas. At the same time, these consultations would be far more specialized than the current ones, as they would focus on each item of the agenda.

We all know well that the CD is a negotiating body, and that we must not transform it into a forum for endless debate or talks about talks. However, the discussions we are suggesting would not have this undesirable character, since they would take place in a strictly informal set-up, which could even be a closed meeting. As they would be focused on preparing the ground for possible negotiations, they would be activities we might term pre-negotiations, in which all relevant options and procedures could be discussed. In short, these exchanges would enable us to move forward in studying and thinking about the many complex aspects of each agenda item but without this entailing, as I have said, a process of negotiating a convention, or even implying a commitment by delegations to the idea of entering eventually into negotiating the terms of such a convention. This would enable the CD to bring viewpoints closer to formulas of compromise and understanding which might facilitate agreement on the commencement of the actual negotiation of a convention. Hence this is a suggestion of limited scope which the President of the Conference himself could put into practice, in the course of his normal duties, either before the adoption of the programme of work or afterwards. The Chilean delegation presents this suggestion to the Conference in the hope of facilitating its functioning, since we sincerely believe it could contribute in some measure to achieving this important objective.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of Chile for his statement and his thoughtful reflections on our work, as well as the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium, Ambassador André Mernier.

Mr. MERNIER (Belgium) (translated from French): Mr. Presdient, since I am taking the floor for the first time under your presidency, I would like to begin by congratulating you on your accession to this lofty function and assuring you of the full cooperation of my delegation.

It is the privilege of ambassadors called by their Governments to other duties to take the floor as it were to take stock of their assignment and to reflect on the prospects for the institution they have to leave. In this spirit, allow me to take one of the last plenary meetings of the Conference on Disarmament to sum up or at least trace the main outlines of the situation as my delegation sees it. Unfortunately, this situation is not at all encouraging. For three years the Conference on Disarmament has been hesitating and prevaricating. For three years no serious negotiations have been launched. This state of affairs is all the more alarming because there is no shortage of challenges. Allow me to devote a few words to them.

(Mr. Mernier, Belgium)

First of all, nuclear disarmament. This question is obviously an absolute priority for all of us, including - I am happy to say - those who are principally concerned. We cannot doubt the resolve of the United States of America and Russia to continue the START process. This process, which is and should remain a bilateral process, has already led to important achievements. Yet much remains to be done to reduce a threat which hangs over all of us and is legitimately everybody's concern. This common interest should be acknowledged, and here the Conference on Disarmament has a part to play by institutionalizing a dialogue, an exchange of information, which at present do not exist. It is fortunate in this respect that the nuclear States have responded positively to the proposal made by five countries, including my own, for seeking ways and means of establishing such an exchange. The priority allocated to nuclear disarmament will not disappear overnight, since it stems from the size of the existing arsenals and the gravity of the threat they represent.

Still on nuclear matters, as regards non-proliferation, it is worrying, alarming, that more than four years after the adoption of Ambassador Shannon's mandate and report the negotiations on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for explosive purposes have not been able to begin. This is all the more serious since nothing has changed as to substance. The need for such a treaty remains urgent. So how can we come to terms with such inertia? Neither procedural quibbles nor tactical subtleties can justify the present vacuum. We can never repeat too often that a cut-off treaty is in everybody's interest, particularly the non-nuclear members of the NPT. We can never repeat too often that it is an indispensable brake on vertical proliferation. Is the present situation not paradoxical? The nuclear Powers are offering to impose new restrictions upon themselves, while certain potential beneficiaries of this cut-off are manoeuvring and making demands which are paralysing negotiations whose conclusion can only strengthen their security. Just as worrying recently is the challenge posed by the deployment of weapons in space. Technological developments are making such an enterprise more and more feasible and therefore more and more tempting. Such a change in strategic equilibria could not fail to pose a challenge to the Conference on Disarmament and make its task more difficult. Has this issue not already made the establishment of the agenda and programme of work more complicated this year?

This alarming situation naturally raises questions about the way our institution works. In my view, the procedures of the Conference on Disarmament need to be re-examined in the light of the disappointments of the last few years. Three points spontaneously come to mind. First, consensus. This rule cannot be challenged because it is at the basis and it is the corollary of our aspiration to universality. Recently, however, the consensus has been distorted into a veto. The ease, the heedlessness with which it is too often resorted to are redolent of the abuse of rights. A change of attitude can only facilitate our work. And finally, groups. This structure must be reconsidered. It is a vestige of the cold war and no longer corresponds with present facts. Who, indeed, is unaware that this pernicious anachronism is slowly tipping the old East-West opposition into a North-South antagonism which is even more sterile? It is not enough to be aware of this danger, we also have to find an answer to it. Even more disturbing is the

(Mr. Mernier, Belgium)

constraint of the annual renewal of the agenda and the programme of work. For an institution whose working year is limited to 24 weeks, this annual procedure is a real shackle. Is it not time to change this rule, whose application has made the Conference on Disarmament into a new Sisyphus? Is it not time to agree on the automatic rolling over of the agenda and the programme of work from one year to the next; on preserving in this way what has been achieved in the long and difficult negotiations which have led to their adoption?

I have dwelt at length on the rules of procedure, but for all that one should not believe that a modification of the rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament can on its own bring us out of the deadlock. We must not forget that it is the political will of States which is decisive here. If this remains weak, or missing, the paralysis will persist. No change to the rules of procedure can replace the collective will to conduct a dialogue, to negotiate and to reach a conclusion.

I cannot leave Geneva without making a more personal summary of this important stage of my career. As for many of my colleagues, these three years have been spent on disarmament in the broadest sense of the word, that is, well beyond the Conference on Disarmament stricto sensu. Thus it was that I had an opportunity to be personally and deeply involved in the Ottawa Process, to see it reach a conclusion and to be present at the first conference of States parties last May in Maputo. Many people in this room have had this experience and no doubt have drawn the same conclusions. The most important is assuredly that when political will is fed by public opinion it can achieve great things, and can do so fast and well. I must also mention the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. After having headed the Belgian delegation, I had the good fortune to be the Vice-Chairman in 1996 and the Chairman in 1998. These experiences have been of great interest to me and have deeply convinced me of the value of this annual exercise. It is clearly important for these New York reunions to take place, but it is also essential for the Geneva delegations to bring regularly to New York the expert knowledge and experience which only the Conference on Disarmament can provide. I would also like to say how happy I am to have been able to participate right from the beginning in the two expert groups set up by the Secretary-General on the complex and very urgent problem of small arms. This question, which is still far from being solved, will keep you very busy, ladies and gentlemen, in the coming years.

Finally, allow me to pay tribute to the colleagues who are present here for the assistance they have given me over these years. Their knowledge, their know-how, their advice, their collegiality have been extremely precious to me. I cannot hide the interest and often the intense joy I experienced in seeing several among them display their art and their professional skill. This will remain for sure one of my best memories of Geneva and even New York. Each of us, of course, upholds the positions and interests of his Government. However, never has the sense of collegiality failed, never have our fundamental differences given rise to any personal animosity. This is another sign of professionalism, which we cannot but welcome. Finally, the secretariat, and especially Ambassador Petrovsky and his deputy Mr. Bensmail,

(Mr. Mernier, Belgium)

have always assisted me with their experience and valuable advice, as has Mrs. Lewis and her UNIDIR team. It would be remiss of me to overlook the interpreters and the entire technical staff, without whom the Conference could not work. I would like to conclude, Mr. President, by paying a personal tribute to you and to your many predecessors, for the tenacity which you have shown to make this body an essential forum which is so necessary to the international community for its security and future. It is also with pleasure that I welcome Mr. Dhanapala, who is sitting beside you. His interest in our work has never faltered, and his advice and friendship have always been most valuable to me.

The PRESIDENT: I am grateful to the distinguished Ambassador of Belgium for his statement and for the very kind words he has addressed to all of us and to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands, Ambassador Frank Majoor.

Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands): I have detected during the course of my participation in the deliberations in the already overregulated Conference on Disarmament a new unwritten rule which I would like to baptize the "Mounir Zahran rule" and to which I, although not exactly a staunch defender of the CD's rigid rules, am going to adhere. The distinguished Ambassador of Egypt recently made an impressive farewell speech of nine pages after having served in the Conference for nine years. Two weeks ago the distinguished Ambassador of Canada made a thought-provoking farewell speech of four pages after having participated for four years in the CD's deliberations and negotiations. And there are more examples of this linear relationship between the length of the stay and the farewell speech. So, according to that rule, my farewell will not exceed two pages.

This "imposed" self-restraint is not particularly difficult to exercise in my case. After two years of hard work I hardly have anything to show for it and no personal achievements really to be proud of. I was present, but unfortunately not at the or any creation. Also, I did not hold any office other than that of representative of my country: not the always challenging function of President of the Conference (Mr. President, my heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of this high office for the rest of this year, and many thanks for the kind words addressed to me); not the increasingly rare function of Chairman of an Ad Hoc Committee; not the fulfilling position of Special Coordinator; and not even the prestigious coordinatorship of the Western Group. Seen from your table, Mr. President, I simply moved from the right side of the central back bench to the far corner of the left wing, where I am now sitting since the welcome and long overdue expansion of the Conference. And here, a warm welcome to Ireland, Ecuador, Tunisia, Malaysia and Kazakhstan to our midst.

Most of you identify me and my country with "Transparency in armaments", one of the subjects to which we continue to attach great importance and to which some of you unfortunately - and, if I may say, mistakenly - have assigned low priority, although transparency and confidence-building, difficult as these concepts are, are at the root of any security arrangement

(Mr. Majoor, Netherlands)

and a precondition for peace and stability. My wish would be that our traditional United Nations resolution dealing with transparency and the United Nations arms register will surpass 100 co-sponsors this year, and more importantly, will be adopted, as in the early years of the register, without a vote.

I am however not going to dwell on that subject. I am also not going to reiterate the merits of the proposal of the five (Belgium, Germany, Italy, Norway and the Netherlands) on the issue of nuclear disarmament, although that proposal - whether you like it or not - remains at least one of the two keys to a breakthrough on the work programme of the CD. A focused exchange of information and views on nuclear disarmament is more imminent than ever, as events and developments, also most recently, clearly demonstrate.

What I want to share with you today are three or four observations on the past two years in Geneva, which have been enriching, both from a personal and a professional viewpoint.

First, I now have a better understanding of what is meant by the CD being the sole negotiating body on disarmament. It clearly does not mean - what I was led to believe - that the CD solely negotiates; nor that it does negotiate. It turns out that it means that the CD can theoretically negotiate, but prefers not to do so until all underlying problems have been resolved, by the CD or preferably elsewhere.

My second observation is that the CD therefore has become - and I hope only for the time being - a forum for "dialogue and deliberations, rather than negotiations". If under the prevailing international security circumstances we see value in at least pursuing a dialogue in the CD on disarmament - and I believe so - then we should be more generous in allowing for a focused dialogue. Some proper means should be found - and Ambassador Illanes made valuable proposals and presented valuable ideas on this subject - to avoid linkage and the strict application of the consensus rule for the establishment of mechanisms that provide for a focused dialogue, be it special coordinators or ad hoc committees with a deliberative mandate.

Thirdly, the group structure of the CD is not conducive to open and focused dialogue. As the group structure now functions it mainly serves as a shield for those delegations who want to play hide-and-seek.

Lastly, it has become much clearer to me what is meant by the CD being the best club in town. Many, mainly outside the CD, associate it with the culinary traditions and savoir vivre of disarmament delegates, whether they reside in Geneva or for longer periods in New York. Indeed, it cannot be denied that the CD maintains a high standard in this respect. And I enjoyed that particularly in my final days. Another meaning is that the CD is the haute école of international diplomacy. Ambassador Moher also referred to this. There is indeed some truth in this, although during my two-year curriculum many courses were cancelled, particularly those on "negotiating skills", while the classes in "delaying tactics" and "creative obstruction" became somewhat repetitive. The third meaning of the best club - and for me that is the real meaning - is the unique way colleagues in the CD get along with each other. The CD is well known for maintaining a "good atmosphere" -

(Mr. Majoor, Netherlands)

one of its main objectives and achievements nowadays - despite sometimes forceful exchanges. I have never before experienced such an intellectual group of colleagues, with such profound knowledge of the subjects at hand, with so much experience in and commitment to multilateral cooperation in the field of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation and at the same time so extraordinarily friendly, open, and hospitable and - I am afraid I have to add - professionally so regrettably underutilized at this point in time.

It was a privilege and a very special experience to have participated in the deliberations of the Conference. I thank you, Mr. President, for the pleasant cooperation and friendship that I have encountered, and I include in those thanks all your predecessors of the last two years. I also would like to thank the Secretary-General, Vladimir Petrovsky, the Deputy Secretary-General, Abdelkader Bensmail, and their devoted staff, Under-Secretary-General, Jayantha Dhanapala, and all my colleagues here and my own staff during these two years - Onno Kervers, Thymen Kouwenaar, Henriette Houben and Mireille Geerlings - for their cooperation and friendship. Thank you all.

I am going to miss the CD, Geneva and New York tremendously, but most of all my colleagues; I am sure, however, that we will meet again here in Geneva, in The Hague - a major candidate for the seat of the BW organization - or elsewhere.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of the Netherlands for his very stimulating statement - concise statement, I should say, and for the kind words addressed to the Chair and to his colleagues.

That concludes my list of speakers for today. Is there any other delegation which wishes to take the floor this morning? I see none.

Before bringing our meeting to a close I would just say a few brief words about my own continuing work as President. As I foreshadowed last week, I intended to be energetic in continuing the pattern of intensive consultations of my predecessors in trying to test whether there remained any scope for agreement on a work programme. I have done that and a number of you will be aware of the extent of those consultations. I intend to continue in that process over the coming days as we at the same time and simultaneously start our work on the annual report. I do that since I do remain hopeful of some further convergence in the time available, and I continue this work in the belief that agreement on a work programme, or at the very least some consolidated convergence on it, will enhance our prospects for expeditious commencement of our substantive work as soon as possible.

With those brief remarks, I conclude our business for today. The next plenary meting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 2 September at 10 a.m., and I would remind you that, as I said earlier, we will convene in an informal plenary meeting in 10 minutes' time to start the consideration of the draft annual report.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.835
2 September 1999

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 2 September 1999, at 10.20 a.m.

President: Mr. Leslie Luck (Australia)

GE.99-65780 (E)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 835th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament, and may I, at the outset, extend a very warm welcome, on behalf of all of us, to two new colleagues who have joined us for the first time today, Ambassador Westdal of Canada and Ambassador Sanders of the Netherlands, who are very welcome among our fraternity here, and let us assure them of our full cooperation and support in the discharge of their functions. I am also pleased to welcome the participants in the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship and Training Programme who are observing the proceedings of the plenary this morning. I hope they will benefit from exposure to our forum, and especially from the presentations that will be made to them on various aspects of our work. I wish them a very fruitful stay in Geneva.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Slovakia and China. Before giving them the floor, I should like to remind you that immediately following this plenary meeting we shall hold an informal plenary meeting to continue consideration of our draft annual report, as contained in document CD/WP.503.

With those few remarks, I should now like to give the floor to the representative of Slovakia, Ambassador Kálmán Petócz.

Mr. PETÓCZ (Slovakia): Mr. President, at the outset I would like to extend to you, on behalf of the Slovak delegation, our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. I would also wish to express words of appreciation to your five predecessors for their untiring work. It is a great honour for me to address this Conference with a general statement for the first time since my appointment to the ambassadorial post. Allow me to assure you of my delegation's fullest support of your endeavour to advance the work of this negotiating forum. I would also like to take this opportunity to extend our best regards to Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, Secretary-General of the CD, and to his deputy, Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, as well as to the other members of the secretariat, and to convey our appreciation for their valuable contribution to our work. It gives me great pleasure to welcome the newly admitted member States - Ireland, Ecuador, Tunisia, Malaysia and Kazakhstan - and I look forward to working with them to achieve the common goals of this Conference. Last but not least, I should like to greet our newly arrived colleagues, Ambassador Westdal of Canada and Ambassador Sanders of the Netherlands, wishing them a successful and rewarding mission here in Geneva.

When I arrived in Geneva in spring this year, I made just a short introductory statement in the CD with the intention of delivering a general statement after the Conference commenced its substantial work. However, since under this schedule you might never again hear me speaking in the plenary, I decided to take the floor today in spite of the fact that we have not commenced the work. My paper has four pages, which means, in light of Ambassador Majoor's rule, that I expect to be here with you for four years. I am absolutely sure that we can approve a programme of work well before the end of my term, and with this firm belief in mind, I deliver this speech.

(Mr. Petócz, Slovakia)

I would like to offer a review of our basic positions with regard to the main issues of disarmament, the work of the Conference itself, as well as to highlight some of my country's achievements in the field of disarmament in the recent past.

It is indeed unsatisfactory that the CD has lost another year which could have been used far more progressively. In January it seemed logical to us that the Conference resume its negotiations where it left off last year. Therefore we supported the proposal (CD/1566) of the then CD President, Ambassador Grey, with which we associated the prospect of commanding a general consensus. This, unfortunately, did not happen. As the Conference continued to discuss the programme of work for this year's session, we noted a certain number of other proposals or initiatives made by the Presidents, regional groups, groups of States and even single delegations. Some of these attempted to formulate a comprehensive programme of work, while others sought either to adopt only a limited programme of work or to concentrate on particular parts of the agenda. I would like to place on record that our priority was - and still is - to have a comprehensive programme of work, although we have been ready to support, as the last resort, the idea of having a limited one. My delegation's strong belief that goodwill, a constructive approach and the necessary amount of flexibility are the essence of any progress has led us to expressly support - or at least not to object to - the majority of those efforts. It is our view that further elaboration on the so-called "Ambassador Dembri's package", which has brought this body closer to a consensus than ever before, will enable us to overcome this unfavourable situation. We deem it appropriate to effectively use the rest of this year's session, as well as the upcoming inter-sessional period, for consultations with a view to narrowing down the remaining differences and reaching the long-sought consensus. This should enable us to start substantive negotiations next year without any unnecessary delay.

The promotion of international peace and security is closely tied to the implementation of global instruments that aim to halt the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and strive for their eventual elimination. Indeed, the Sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to be held next year in New York, and the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the CTBT, to be held this autumn in Vienna, are the most important events in this sphere organized under the aegis of the United Nations. Aiming at the universalization of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and further progress in nuclear disarmament, the conferences are supposed to bring a new impetus to these endeavours.

Slovakia, as a country using nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes, was among the first who signed and ratified the CTBT as one of the 44 States listed in annex II to the Treaty. We have been actively involved in the work of the Preparatory Commission for the CTBTO, as well as in the preparation of the forthcoming Vienna Conference. The implementation of the integrated safeguard system of the International Atomic Energy Agency constitutes in our view a crucial element in strengthening the non-proliferation regime and would make a beneficial contribution to the 2000 NPT Conference. My Government is now in the course of adapting the national legislation in order to meet the requirements of the aforementioned new safeguards measures.

(Mr. Petócz, Slovakia)

Besides the NPT and the CTBT, I would like to dwell upon another substantial issue: the fissile material cut-off treaty. As identified and then confirmed by various multilateral forums, including the United Nations General Assembly and the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the NPT, the FMCT remains the next challenge in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. Quite naturally, it occupies the top of my delegation's priorities. We expect that the future treaty should address both these aspects. We welcomed last year's decision of the CD, based on the 1995 Shannon report, to establish an ad hoc committee under agenda item 1 to negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Unfortunately, little chance was given to this subsidiary body and during its two meetings the CD could hardly reach any tangible result. Although the FMCT deliberations continued in the CD plenary format, they could not substitute for substantive negotiations in the ad hoc committee setting. Despite the revealed conceptual differences and differing positions of the CD delegations, the imperative of an immediate resumption of substantive negotiations still persists. The key attributes of the future treaty are contained in the ad hoc committee's very mandate and my delegation associates itself with them unreservedly. Viewed realistically, the FMCT should ban future fissile material production for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Furthermore, it should limit the fissile material stockpiles available for use in nuclear weapons irreversibly. This must be accompanied by a vital verification system. The vast experience and repository of expertise of IAEA make it the most appropriate body for this purpose.

The dynamics of the Ottawa process on the international ban of landmines have exceeded even the most optimistic expectations. The whole procedure - from its inception in 1996, to the text elaboration and signature by the majority of the international community in 1997, to the exceptional growth in the number of ratification instruments in 1998, and the Convention's final entry into force in March 1999 - was carried out with tremendous speed, which ranks it among the most illustrious achievements in the history of disarmament efforts. I am proud to announce that on 25 February 1999, Slovakia ratified the Ottawa Convention. In accordance with article 17 of this Convention, it entered into force for my country on 1 August 1999.

In joining the international fight against these abhorrent and inhuman weapons from the very beginning, Slovakia has stressed its determination to achieve the ultimate goal of their total and eventual elimination. This provides me with the opportunity to encourage hesitant States to do likewise. My country has embarked on the path of promoting the universalization of the Convention. It is a great honour for us to serve as rapporteur of the Standing Committee of Experts on Stockpile Destruction, one of the five committees which bear the responsibility of inter-sessional work between the First and Second Meetings of the States Parties to the Ottawa Convention in Maputo and Geneva respectively. Along with our firm and unabating commitment to the Ottawa process, we believe that the commencement of negotiations in the CD on a ban of APL transfers would be a very positive step in the right direction. We would see those two processes as complementary rather than competitive.

(Mr. Petócz, Slovakia)

I would like to reiterate Slovakia's offer to provide our expertise, environment-friendly technology and capacities for the destruction of APL stockpiles to interested countries which do not possess such means. Our aim is to contribute to the growth in the number of signatories and States parties to the Ottawa Convention by extending a helping hand to overcome the problems that may prevent States from joining. Furthermore, we have developed very effective mine clearance devices, whose capabilities and safe operation have won extraordinary appraisal by experts, especially in the territory of former Yugoslavia. We are ready to provide our expertise in demining, training capabilities and resources for landmine victim rehabilitation and assistance to States and institutions within and perhaps even beyond our region. We look forward to entering into a dialogue with our prospective partners to find ways of making use of our resources for the benefit of people and regions affected by landmines.

With regard to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, and its Protocols, I am pleased to state that our Parliament is scheduled to approve amended Protocol II and Protocol IV in the coming days.

On 5 August 1999 we welcomed with satisfaction the enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament by five new member States. Some of them had waited to become fully-fledged members for years. We endorsed this limited decision, although our basic position on the question of CD expansion is to enable full membership to all States who declare their interest in participating in the work of this forum. I would like to use this opportunity to pay tribute to Ambassador Hofer of Switzerland on the determined work which he has undertaken as Special Coordinator on this issue. In our view this subject still has not been fully exhausted. Since the CD rules of procedure stipulate that the membership of the Conference will be reviewed at regular intervals, my delegation is convinced that the CD should remain actively seized of the matter. It seems quite appropriate to strengthen the ways in which this rule can materialize in practice. We will therefore support the reappointment of a Special Coordinator on CD expansion.

To conclude, let me reaffirm the significance my country attaches to the work of the Conference on Disarmament and the continued constructive support that this forum enjoys from my delegation.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Slovakia for his statement and for the kind words that he has addressed to the Chair. I should now like to give the floor to the representative of China, the distinguished Ambassador Li.

Mr. LI (China) (translated from Chinese): Mr. President, the Chinese delegation congratulates you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and expresses appreciation for your endeavours in seeking consensus on the programme of work and your efforts in drafting the annual report of the Conference. I take this opportunity to express my welcome to Ambassador Sanders of the Netherlands and the Ambassador of Canada,

(Mr. Li, China)

newly arrived in the CD. I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome the staff of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research attending our proceedings today.

Mr. President, the 1999 session of the CD is about to be concluded. During this session, your predecessors and you yourself have made earnest and unremitting efforts to complete the programme of work for the year and made proposals to that end; so have a number of delegations. However, due to difficulties in bridging the differences among delegations on two important agenda items, namely, nuclear disarmament and prevention of an arms race in outer space, the programme of work is still not in our reach. The Chinese delegation has found this situation rather disappointing.

The Chinese delegation believes the regrettable situation in the CD this year is mainly attributable to two factors. First, the work of the Conference, a multilateral disarmament negotiating body, is closely related to, and directly affected by, the overall international peace and security situation. A series of developments this year in the field of international peace and security have deeply affected international relations and States' confidence and security perceptions, which in turn have inevitably affected the entire international disarmament process, not excluding the Conference on Disarmament. Secondly, the divergence among member States on the CD's programme of work is not simply procedural but reflects differences over priorities for the international disarmament agenda. The CD's programme of work should take this fully into consideration and accommodate the concerns of all member States to the largest extent possible, in a comprehensive and balanced manner. A display of political will and flexibility is required from all sides. Clearly, further efforts in this regard are needed.

That people feel upset about the current situation of the Conference is understandable. However, it is not appropriate to call into question the role and credibility of the Conference, or to go so far as to propose its suspension. The Chinese delegation believes that the Conference on Disarmament, the only multilateral disarmament negotiating body, is of irreplaceable status and role. Even if it has not been able to get down to treaty negotiations for the time being, it is still an important forum for exchanges on major issues of international peace and security and on some specific disarmament items. It can help enhance mutual understanding and explore the possibilities for negotiations on certain issues. It is our hope that the international situation will improve and delegations can accommodate each other's concerns in a practical and flexible manner in order to reach early agreement on a comprehensive and balanced programme of work next year. In that case, the situation of the Conference could take a favourable turn.

The current session made major progress when the Conference formally expanded and admitted five new members, namely, Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia, on 5 August. My delegation once again welcomes them warmly and hopes to cooperate with them closely. The admission of new members enables the Conference to enjoy wider representation. China has always had a positive attitude towards appropriate expansion of the Conference. We take note of the positions expressed by delegations on further expansion. In this

(Mr. Li, China)

regard, we believe that factors of political balance, the optimum size of the Conference as a negotiating body, and efficiency should be taken into consideration.

At the plenary of 19 August distinguished Ambassador Munir Akram of Pakistan made a statement on the draft Indian nuclear doctrine released by the Indian National Security Advisory Committee. The statement received wide attention. As a close neighbour of South Asia, China genuinely hopes for peace, security and stability in the region, with the tensions easing and the nuclear arms race being brought to an end. In a statement in that connection, the Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman reiterated that United Nations Security Council resolution 1172 on South Asian nuclear tests should be implemented as soon as possible in a comprehensive and serious manner.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of China for his statement and for the kind words that he has addressed to the Chair.

That concludes my list of speakers for the day. Is there any other delegation that wishes to take the floor? I see none.

Before bringing this morning's proceedings to a close, I feel I should say a few words about the situation with the work programme and the intensive consultations I have been conducting in the period since I assumed the presidency. It is now clearly only a few days before the end of our session in 1999, and it therefore seems clear that notwithstanding some indications that important delegations have fresh instructions and new flexibility, we no longer have any time to complete negotiations on a work programme. This is indeed, I think, unfortunate, and the concern among delegations that we should have made progress in reaching agreement on a work programme and should have reached a consensus on one has been reflected in a number of statements that have been made before this plenary. Nonetheless, I believe this situation needs to be reflected in an appropriate manner in our annual report.

The preparations of the annual report have been making progress through informal consultations and informal discussions over the past week, and there is still some further work to do which we will pursue later in the day. I have found in the consultations that I have been conducting widely among delegations of the Conference and among the groups constituting the Conference that increasingly delegates wish to turn their minds to how we properly describe the results of our work in the annual report, and specifically how we deal with the conclusion that it has not been possible to reach agreement on a programme of work.

I must say that I have greatly appreciated the accessibility and the patience and the wise counsel of all my colleagues in the Conference in the recent days as we have had to intensify our work. As you will be aware, it has been my view that there is a very broad sentiment within the Conference that, notwithstanding our inability to reach consensus on a programme of work, we should somehow find a way to continue our efforts in that regard and to try and reach convergence on outstanding issues and narrow gaps.

(The President)

In response to that sentiment, I have felt compelled to take some initiatives of my own as President, but initiatives which as best as I can have been designed to fully reflect the collective views of the Conference, and it is my hope that we will be able to focus on those ideas and move expeditiously in the next period, in the next day or so, to conclude our work on the annual report and resolve a constructive and forward-looking component to that report.

As delegations will be aware, it is our intention to return to that work shortly after the conclusion of this plenary when, after a short break of 10 minutes, we will reconvene in informal plenary session.

With those few words and in the absence of any other delegation wishing to take the floor, I would declare this morning's meeting closed with the reminder that we will meet again in plenary session on Tuesday, 7 September 1999, at 10 a.m., at which I intend hopefully to conclude the 1999 session of the Conference.

The meeting rose at 10.45 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.836
7 September 1999

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 7 September 1999, at 10.20 a.m.

President: Mr. Leslie Luck (Australia)

GE.99-65882 (E)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 836th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Finland (who will be speaking on behalf of the European Union), the United States of America, Hungary, France, the United Kingdom and Bulgaria.

Once we have listened to the speakers inscribed, I intend to suspend the plenary meeting and immediately convene an informal plenary in order to consider the draft annual report to the United Nations General Assembly, as contained in document CD/WP.503/Rev.1. Thereafter, I shall resume the plenary meeting in order to formally adopt our draft annual report.

Before giving the floor to the speakers inscribed for today, I should like, on behalf of all of us, to bid farewell to our colleague from Hungary, Ambassador Péter Náray, who will be shortly leaving Geneva. During his four years as representative of his country in the Conference, Ambassador Náray, in his capacity as Special Coordinator on the review of the agenda of the CD in 1997 and 1998, contributed to our common efforts aimed at developing an agenda for the Conference which would take into account the changes that have taken place since the end of the cold war. I am sure that I speak on behalf of all of us when I express to Ambassador Náray and his family our very best wishes for continued success and for personal happiness.

I now give the floor to the representative of Finland, Ambassador Markku Reimaa, who will speak on behalf of the European Union.

Mr. REIMAA (Finland): Mr. President, it is perhaps a bit late to congratulate, but since this is the first time I take the floor during your presidency, I would like to assure you of the full cooperation of my delegation.

Finland has the honour to take the floor today on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia) and the associated countries Cyprus and Malta align themselves with this declaration.

As the 1999 session of the Conference on Disarmament is drawing to its conclusion, let us assure you that we support your efforts to come to an agreement to start substantive work as soon as possible. At the same time, we appreciate the work done by the previous Presidents on this difficult issue.

The fissile material cut-off treaty has been the long-standing goal of the international community. In 1993, the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously recommended negotiations on an FMCT. In the decision on "Principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament" the States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty unanimously recognized the importance of such negotiations in the full realization and effective implementation of article VI of the NPT. In 1995, and again

(Mr. Reimaa, Finland)

in 1998, the Conference on Disarmament decided to establish an ad hoc committee. The General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously welcomed this decision in 1998 and encouraged the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish this ad hoc committee at the beginning of the 1999 session.

The European Union believes that a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty constitutes, after the CTBT, a major step towards the achievement of both the nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament objectives envisaged in the NPT document on principles and objectives.

The European Union is convinced that an FMCT, by irreversibly limiting the fissile material stockpiles available for use in nuclear weapons and by establishing an effective verification system, will strengthen the international nuclear non-proliferation regime and will constitute a significant step towards the realization and effective implementation of article VI of the NPT.

In view of the agreement in the CD in August 1998 to establish an ad hoc committee on FMCT, it is incumbent on the CD to take an early decision to resume these negotiations.

The member States of the European Union and the associated countries have a very clear position and objective: they will continue to work strenuously for the FMCT, they are ready to participate in negotiations on such a treaty actively and constructively and they will promote an early and successful outcome of negotiations.

In conclusion, the EU is of the view that the negotiations should start immediately and efforts should be pursued vigorously to reach an agreement on the remaining elements of a substantive programme of work.

I have asked that the declaration of the European Union be issued as an official document of the Conference on Disarmament.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Finland for his statement and for the kind words which he has addressed to the Chair. I give the floor now to the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Robert T. Grey.

Mr. GREY (United States of America): Mr. President, first of all, my congratulations to you upon your assumption of the presidency during the important final phase of our annual session. I can assure you of the continued full support of my delegation as you carry out your responsibilities.

I am taking the floor briefly as our 1999 session comes to a close to put on the record my delegation's view of the outcome of our proceedings this year. A great deal of effort has gone into the search for compromises that would allow our work to begin, especially on a fissile material cut-off treaty. Unfortunately, we were unable to arrive at a mutually satisfactory

(Mr. Grey, United States)

arrangement, and yet another year has passed without any material progress to show to the international community. In fact, compared to last year, when at least two ad hoc committees were established, this year can only be described as especially impoverished. We have allowed the best (or what purports to be the best from some national perspectives) to become the enemy of the good. In fact, it appears that some may have used the best as a tactic to deliberately prevent any good from being done, especially the good that we all have agreed to do - FMCT.

Nevertheless, I choose to take the view that, while the glass isn't even close to half full, it has at least a little bit of water in it. Our discussions over the past several months have brought out clearly what is possible and what is not. In sometimes painful debates, we have laboured to define our various national positions and to explain the rationale for them. While we have not been able to agree, at least the parameters of the debate have been clarified, and the options available to us have been outlined with a high degree of precision. Compared with the work done by the CD in the first half of this decade, this may not be much. But at least it provides the possibility of preparing the CD to begin work rapidly in the next session.

As we move into the millennium year, I would hope that the CD could build on this foundation to reach agreement on a work programme as early as next January. We have struggled mightily to get where we are now, which can be defined as a point where we have agreement on virtually all elements of a work programme save two. I know that you and your successor plan to consult intensively during the coming months to see whether further flexibility can be achieved so that a work programme can be put into place at the beginning of our 2000 session. For my part, I plan to work with you, Mr. President, to take advantage of any flexibility that may exist on the part of my Government so that the mutual interests of all CD members in achieving a work programme can be met. I hope others can do so as well. With this objective in mind, I can only endorse your call for flexibility and pragmatism on the part of all CD members in their talks with you. It's the only hope we have of avoiding yet another sterile year on the multilateral arms control front, and for beginning the new millennium with a solid and full-scale arms control programme of work. With luck, we'll get there.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of the United States of America for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I give the floor now to the representative of Hungary, Ambassador Péter Náray.

Mr. NÁRAY (Hungary): Mr. President, since this is the first time that I take the floor under your presidency, I wish to congratulate you on the assumption of the post of President of the Conference, and I would like to thank you for the very kind words which you addressed to me. I have asked for the floor in my personal capacity because at the end of this month I will leave my post as Hungary's Permanent Representative to the CD. I take this opportunity to bid farewell and to extend my best wishes to the CD for the future.

(Mr. Náray, Hungary)

Most of my colleagues who have recently left Geneva complained that they had done almost nothing in the last few years in the CD. Perhaps they were right and our results have been really meagre lately. But it is also possible that they just did not recognize the value of what they had achieved during their period in this distinguished body and that history will correct their judgement. Let us take for example the speech made by the Ambassador of the Netherlands some days ago. He also spoke to us of his negative feelings and disappointment due to his two years of inactivity in Geneva. However, he seemed to underestimate the scientific importance of the discovery he had made in Geneva that there is a linear relationship between the length of a diplomat's stay in Geneva and the number of pages of his or her farewell statement. I think the time has come to evaluate our deeds properly, and we should recognize that our colleague has made a Majoor contribution to the development of international farewell speech law and has opened new avenues for future generations of CD diplomats.

Mr. President, in this spirit, I make a confession. Now I see the importance of my years in Geneva as a CD representative differently than a short time ago. You may remember - actually you referred to the fact - that in 1997 and 1998, I had the honour to be appointed by the CD as Special Coordinator on the review of the agenda. Both years, after long hours and days of consultations with many members, I reportedly came to the conclusion that consensus on the future agenda was not within reach and, therefore, I was not in a position to make any substantive recommendations. Of course, I also was frustrated, and perhaps that was the reason why I finished my statements with a slight exaggeration that according to my impressions, delegations were interested and willing to take up this issue the following year. Now, at the end of our annual session, you can rightly tell me that I misled the CD, because, in 1999, even the appointment of special coordinators was not within its possibilities or even its wishes.

The reason that I still have a feeling of satisfaction from my activities as Special Coordinator is that others might appreciate my work. Recently, theatre experts told me that thanks to the Internet, they had access to my reports in which they could identify the best absurd drama they had recently read. They were seriously considering nominating the CD for the next Academy Award for inventing genuinely new dramatic structures which would certainly revolutionize modern theatre and film. "Look at the texts of the players and the stage management", they told me with enthusiasm. On stage No. 1 - let's call it negotiating room XVII or XVIII - the players create the impression that they are speaking the same language and that they understand each other when using such expressions as "agenda", "work programme", "procedure", "substance" or "consensus". The story flows smoothly towards the finale, which is usually dramatic, but not beyond expectations. However, when they march on to a different stage, which they call the "Council room", an unexpected new dimension of absurdity is added to the play. In this room, the same players do not understand the same words because they attach to them meanings totally different from some moments before. What was called "agenda" on stage No. 1, here, for some, becomes "programme of work", while "programme of work" is referred to as "calendar of meetings", and there are players who insist that in this room "procedure is substance". The dramatic tension is

(Mr. Náray, Hungary)

increased by frequent references to holy texts and places, such as "Decalogue" or "SSOD I-II-III-IV". The absurdity and the confusion is without equal and worthy of recognition in the world of entertainment.

I am afraid that the word "consensus" may get a new meaning if the CD continues its practice established in the last two years. If I am not mistaken, all members who took the floor this year, and last year, said that the time had come to start negotiations on an FMCT. To my understanding, this could be called a "consensus". Nevertheless, in terms of substantive work, nothing has happened. Perhaps a new interpretation is in the making and at the end of the day we will be told that consensus is not enough to do something in the CD; we need a "consensus plus" for a decision in this body. Is that not again an absurdity? I hope that the CD will do its best to avoid being associated in future with any sort of drama.

Mr. President, many representatives have expressed concerns about the future of the CD. I share their worries, but I still see some hope on the horizon. I still expect that early next year, without any linkages, you will start negotiations on the text of a nuclear cut-off treaty and negotiations will be finished in a foreseeable future. If not, and if the CD is not engaged in any substantial activity next year either, it will face a grave situation, which will require new approaches. In that case, my suggestion would be to examine the prospects of disarmament negotiations in the CD in general, including the root causes of the problems. I take the view that it is perfectly within the mandate of the CD to address the underlying problems which prevent the commencement of new disarmament negotiations. It would be difficult to argue that preparation of the ground for future negotiations is not within the domain of a multilateral negotiating forum.

When the CD turns toward the root causes of the present stalemate in disarmament negotiations, my humble suggestion would be to address the issue in all its complexity. I know that the CD is not a research institution, but I do not think either that the examination and analysis of the motivations of States with respect to disarmament negotiations should be left entirely to academics and NGOs. Soon, we will celebrate the tenth anniversary of the moment when the world left behind the period of the cold war. I am not sure that we have drawn the necessary conclusions from the fact that we live in a totally new period, when the world is no longer bipolar as it used to be. The CD and its procedures have been shaped with regard to a specific structure which ceased to exist 10 years ago. The meaning of the rule of consensus was totally clear at that time. No disarmament negotiations could be started without a consensus between the major players. I could say that our recent practice is very far from this original concept, or I could add that a part of our rules of procedure is misused. But I also wish to highlight a different aspect of our new epoch. And that is globalization. I know that this phenomenon is referred to very frequently and sometimes without any justification, but I am not aware of any in-depth authentic analysis of the interrelationship between globalization and the willingness of States to engage in disarmament negotiations. I am convinced that the process of globalization has a substantial impact on disarmament issues. Why? The answer is simple. Globalization has accelerated the speed of history. I

(Mr. Náray, Hungary)

would mention here that the end of the cold war - at least in my perception - was already one of the first results of the accelerated globalization process. In the period of globalization, the efficiency or inefficiency of economic and political systems may not be hidden for decades, let alone for centuries, like before. Probably, accelerated historical developments have an impact on the strategies followed by States and their propensity for disarmament negotiations. The losers of history may hope that they can avoid the unavoidable if they are well armed. Or some countries may think that these turbulent times are not appropriate for starting new major disarmament talks. However, it would be good to remind them that countries, as history has already demonstrated, can be destroyed in many ways. One of them is to be engaged in a hopeless arms race.

Let me add that as the representative of Hungary in the CD, I have had no reason to complain about lack of progress in the areas which are closely related to disarmament. In this period, my country has institutionalized its relations with many like-minded partners and we have occupied our seat in the Western Group, which had been left empty for decades for reasons beyond our control. I am confident that my country will also do its best in the future, in this new capacity, for a safer world.

I am already reading the fourth page of my speech. As I am just finishing my fourth year in Geneva, I feel that I should obey the rule formulated by Ambassador Majoor and conclude my statement. However, before doing so, I wish to thank Secretary-General Vladimir Petrovsky, Deputy Secretary-General Abdelkader Bensmail and their excellent staff for their help and cooperation.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Hungary for his statement and for the very kind words he has addressed to the Chair, and wish him well again in the future. I give the floor now to the representative of France, Ambassador Hubert de La Fortelle.

Mr. de La FORTELLE (France) (translated from French): At the moment when the 1999 session of the Conference on Disarmament is drawing to a close, it might not be superfluous to make an initial brief assessment and to outline the prospects that lie ahead of us. The discussions - or rather the sham negotiations - on the preparation of the report that our Conference traditionally submits to the United Nations General Assembly have been instructive on a number of counts, for myself as a relative newcomer.

First of all, I would say that the conclusions of this session strike me as disquieting. I will confine myself to the four most significant conclusions. First of all, immobility: the "tyranny of inertia" finally carried the day over the will to act. Why? A significant majority opted for the easy way out, that of abiding by precedent to the detriment of the more demanding path of innovation, that is, fostering progress on essential subjects.

(Mr. de La Fortelle, France)

Second - reality. Political correctness also won out over straight talking. Why? Here again a majority preferred the easy way out by preferring set speeches to a description of the true situation.

Third - consensus. The golden rule of our institution has been subjected to rough treatment. Why? The very parties who preach morality did not take the trouble to keep the word they had given, both in Geneva and in New York. I am speaking here, of course, of the establishment of the ad hoc committee on cut-off in August 1998 and the resolution on the same subject adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly last December.

Lastly - the New Agenda. The coalition of 7 had recently been endeavouring to project a moderate and responsible image. However, several of its members showed themselves in a completely different light during the discussions last Thursday and Friday. They revealed how little importance they attached to article 11 of their own resolution of last year, which was very favourable to the rapid commencement of cut-off negotiations. It will not be easy to forget such inconsistency.

My second point is that the prospects for the year 2000 session appear very bleak. I will just highlight the three consequences that I think are most disturbing.

First - the programme of work. The basic, if informal, underpinning constituted by Ambassador Dembri's "package", built around three themes - nuclear disarmament, space and the cut-off - in order to reach consensus, was seriously placed in jeopardy during the debates. I am very much afraid that if we stray from that path it will be very difficult for us to find a way out.

Second - the cut-off. The commencement of these essential negotiations has been put off indefinitely. Why? After being accepted by all without a debate in 1998, in 1999 it was called into question through references to preconditions and linkages of which no written trace can be found. Is it not paradoxical, as our colleague Ambassador André Mernier pointed out, to see the nuclear-weapon States urging a start to negotiations which will impose on them major additional constraints but which are rejected by the non-nuclear-weapon States to whom the cut-off is meant to give greater security? If some countries - probably very much in the minority in the Conference on Disarmament - reject this fundamental contribution to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, we must draw the necessary conclusions. To judge by the discussions of the last few days, these negotiations do not stand any greater chance of starting in the year 2000 - at least the early months of the year 2000 - than they did in 1999.

Third - the Conference. The Conference must avoid at all costs a fourth year of deadlock that would lead it into even greater discredit. The inter-sessional consultations will be useful if there is a genuine political will to overcome the current difficulties. If not, they will be but a smokescreen designed to give everyone a clear conscience.

(Mr. de La Fortelle, France)

Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation, I wish you courage and, if possible, success for this period of your term, which will not necessarily be the least difficult.

So where do we stand now? Let us not delude ourselves. The Conference on Disarmament today is gravely ill. Do those who stand conspicuously by its bedside all really wish to see it recover? The practice of laying down systematic linkages, requiring "all or nothing", raising the stakes, is in the process of killing an irreplaceable organization, because the substitutes devised here or there will never secure the agreement of the main players. It is high time that the sorcerer's apprentices recognize this at last.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of France for his comments and especially for his words of support addressed to the Chair.

May I just take this moment to say from a purely national perspective - since I do not have that privilege in my role as President - to just underline that early commencement of negotiations in this Conference on a fissile material cut-off treaty is also a very high priority for Australia in the arms control field, as was explained by our Foreign Minister, Mr. Downer, when he last addressed this Conference. This is because we, like others, believe that the treaty would be a key means to achieve the twin objectives of disarmament and non-proliferation, and on that basis, we would like to see the early re-establishment of an ad hoc committee on FMCT as part of a balanced programme of work in the CD.

I revert now to my role as President. I now give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Ian Soutar.

Mr. SOUTAR (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Mr. President, since this is the first time I have taken the floor during your presidency, might I begin by conveying to you my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency? I would also like to take this opportunity to assure you of the full and unstinting support and cooperation of my delegation during the remainder of your time in office.

When I first considered making a statement, it was in the hope that I would be able to offer you congratulations - as I had hoped to do, long before now, to each of your predecessors - on the re-establishment of an ad hoc committee to negotiate a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). Regrettably, that is not to be. After months of meetings and many hours of consultations, the Conference continues - with the sole exception of the welcome, if long overdue, decision on expansion - to find itself in a lamentable, and, in the British Government's view, totally unacceptable, impasse.

I do not think the hope I harboured over the past eight months particularly unreasonable or naive. I came to the Conference at the start of the year fully expecting to start work on an FMCT negotiation. I have yet to hear a single delegation fail to support the early commencement of cut-off negotiations. I am therefore left wondering how the CD has managed, in its own inimitable way, to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

(Mr. Soutar, United Kingdom)

Recent history certainly suggested a radically different scenario. I can hardly fail, reflecting on the work - or sad lack thereof - that we have been engaged in since the start of the session, to cast my mind back to this time last year. Then, I had the honour of occupying the place you now occupy, Mr. President, and I well recall the pleasure I had in overseeing the creation, on 11 August 1998, of an ad hoc committee under item 1 of our agenda.

I need hardly remind the Conference that that Ad Hoc Committee subsequently recommended that it be re-established at the beginning of this session - a recommendation forcefully endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly last November in its consensus resolution 53/77 I and reflected also in consensus resolution 53/79 B on the report of the CD.

I apologize for repeating facts which are well known to all delegations here, but it is easy, it appears, even at this short remove, to forget that there was consensus within this body for FMCT negotiations when we agreed the last report of the Conference, and that that consensus continued to exist during the inter-sessional period.

Mr. President, it was against this background, and with these positive developments fresh in mind, that my delegation approached the beginning of this year's session. You may well understand our deep disappointment at the subsequent depressing turn of events. We were left wondering why, when consensus existed, the Conference was unable simply to pick up its work where it had left off only a few months before.

What had changed so dramatically in the intervening period? Had FMCT negotiations assumed less importance? I think not. I believe that, just as there was last year and in previous years, there remained in January (and remains to this day) understanding within the international community on what practical steps need to be taken to ensure the elimination of nuclear weapons. This Conference has already negotiated one of the measures called for in the "Principles and objectives" of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference - the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty. The next agreed step is the negotiation of a treaty to ban the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

I will not set out the obvious benefits of an FMCT here. The United Kingdom has already elaborated these at some length in this forum and elsewhere. But I will repeat one clear and uncontested truth: a cut-off treaty will make a substantial, vital and practical contribution to advancing the goal of global nuclear disarmament. There simply cannot be nuclear disarmament without confidence that no new fissile material is being produced for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. An FMCT is not then the last step, but it is the next essential one.

Since the negotiation of a cut-off treaty is the undisputed next step on the road towards nuclear disarmament, and nuclear disarmament is self-evidently accorded an extremely high priority in the CD, the Conference's inability to get down to substantive work on an FMCT is all the more difficult

(Mr. Soutar, United Kingdom)

to explain. Any casual observer would immediately spot the irony in a state of affairs in which those who purport to be the strongest advocates of nuclear disarmament refuse to allow work to begin on what all agree is the most important practical next step forward, unless discussions on nuclear disarmament are held in parallel.

My delegation expected, at the start of this session, to witness the prompt adoption of a work programme modelled closely on that agreed painstakingly last year, following two long years of discussions. In addition to agreement to re-establish ad hoc committees on FMCT and, of course, security assurances, we came to the Conference ready to consider any reasonable proposal capable of commanding consensus on those other items, particularly nuclear disarmament, anti-personnel landmines and transparency in armaments, on which further work was still required at the end of the 1998 session.

To this end, the United Kingdom, together with the United States of America and France, put forward a working paper (CD/1586) on the programme of work of the Conference. This paper acknowledged the extremely high priority accorded to nuclear disarmament, and took up useful language from the earlier proposal put forward by Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Norway. Events since then have shown the mechanism of the latter proposal - the formation of an ad hoc working group - to be acceptable to all. My delegation commends the mandate equally.

I realize, as a representative of a nuclear-weapon State, that I will be damned for what I do say, and damned for what I do not. But I hope I have, at least, made plain the United Kingdom's willingness - if there remains any doubt - to enter immediately into FMCT negotiations and to agree a sensible programme of work for the CD. The United Kingdom has demonstrated its readiness to be flexible in translating its commitment to meaningful progress towards nuclear disarmament from words into deeds, and we look to others to do the same.

Progress depends on the resolve of all delegations. As August 1998 showed, there exists a consensus to start negotiations on an FMCT, its mandate is agreed, it is recognized by all parties to the CD as the logical next step in an incremental process. But it cannot happen because we cannot agree the basis on which other issues will be addressed.

Is this how our predecessors thought the CD would develop? That countries would refuse even to start negotiations because other things needed to be talked about at the same time? You may wonder, like me and many others, how much longer deadlock in the CD can continue. I have heard reform mentioned a number of times and with increasing regularity in recent weeks. Perhaps the CD does now need to take a long, hard look at the way it functions. But I frankly doubt if any amount of self-examination will do any good if delegations are not prepared to honour commitments they have made in the recent past.

(Mr. Soutar, United Kingdom)

In the interests of progress, I look forward, now, to participating in the consultations you will conduct during the inter-sessional period, with a view to starting substantive work at the beginning of next year. My delegation will not renege on its responsibilities, and I urge others to live up to theirs. Only then will the Conference be able to assume its rightful place at the forefront of efforts to promote non-proliferation and disarmament.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his statement and for his words addressed to the Chair. I now have on my list the distinguished representative of Bulgaria, Ambassador Petko Draganov.

Mr. DRAGANOV (Bulgaria): Mr. President, since this is also the first time I am taking the floor under your presidency in a formal meeting, allow me to congratulate you on the skilful way in which you have conducted the work of this Conference and the elaboration of our annual report. Our appreciation goes as well to your predecessors, to the Secretary-General, Mr. Petrovsky, to the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Bensmail, and to the secretariat. The Bulgarian delegation will support your further efforts in the inter-sessional consultations that will hopefully bring about an early start of substantive work in this Conference next year.

It is also my great pleasure and satisfaction to welcome among us the representatives of the five new CD members and to assure them of my delegation's continued cooperation.

May I join in the tribute to Ambassador Náray and the words of well-wishing addressed to him? May I also add our expression of well-meaning and good wishes to the distinguished representative of Romania, Mr. Pavel Grecu, who has also presided over this Conference, who I understand will be leaving us at the end of this month?

Mr. President, today I would like to inform the Conference that on 2 September of this year, the National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria ratified the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty. Under article XIV of the Treaty, Bulgaria is one of the 44 States who have to deposit their instruments of ratification with the United Nations Secretary-General so that the CTBT can enter into force. Today, only half of those States have ratified the Treaty. Well-known difficulties, mainly of a political character, have created this situation. It is of the utmost importance for the international community to intensify its efforts in order to accelerate the ratification process and facilitate the entry into force of the CTBT. We call on all countries who have not yet signed or ratified the Treaty to do so and participate actively in the forthcoming special conference. In the words of a famous State President, and I hope my distinguished colleague from South Africa will allow me the quote, "Now is the time!" Now, more than ever, the disarmament process, and nuclear disarmament in particular, needs a breath of fresh air. Not to mention this Conference.

(Mr. Draganov, Bulgaria)

We hope that the countries sincerely concerned by the present stalemate in the field of disarmament and global security matters will undertake the relevant responsible action.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of Bulgaria for his comments and words of encouragement. I now give the floor to the distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan, who has asked for the floor, Ambassador Akram.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): Mr. President, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the admirable manner in which you have steered the Conference towards its conclusion. You have conducted the business of this Conference in the last few weeks in a patient and dedicated manner, and I believe that because of your perseverance, the Conference, despite its difficulties, will conclude its 1999 session in a positive and forward-looking spirit. My distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom a while ago stated that he realized as a representative of a nuclear-weapon State that he would be damned for what he did say and damned for what he did not say. I must confess that I have had less practice than he has and therefore, I would like to add a few remarks at our meeting today.

Pakistan will support the endeavours to reach a balanced programme of work for the CD next year. We believe that the statements which we have heard so far in the CD today have not fully and objectively reflected the realities which have confronted the Conference and the members of the Conference this year. There were common elements upon which we could have worked to evolve agreement on a programme of work. Further consultations were required to reach agreement on two issues - nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space - and the failure of the CD to reach agreement is because those delegations which were in a very small minority on these issues were unable to make the necessary compromises to reflect the general wish and consensus of the Conference. Unjustified obstacles were placed in the work of the CD on the priority issue of nuclear disarmament as well as the issue of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. It will be necessary for the Conference to deal with these issues in a serious and substantive manner. Nuclear disarmament is the highest priority for disarmament negotiations. The nuclear-weapon States must practise what they preach. No one doubts that the prevention of an arms race in outer space is now another issue requiring urgent attention. We cannot accept that the Conference on Disarmament has no role to play in these vital issues and all that it can do is to simply negotiate redundant non-proliferation measures.

The analyses of the ailments of the CD which have been offered here today are partial. The fact of the matter is that the whole agenda of disarmament has suffered a setback in recent months, and it has suffered a setback for very concrete and tangible reasons: the prospect of revision of the ABM Treaty, the prospect of the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems and theatre missile defences, the likely impact - or negative impact -

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

on the strategic arms talks and agreements of these developments, the possibility of the revival of a nuclear arms race both at the global level and at the regional level in various parts of the world, including my region of South Asia, and then the announcement of India's nuclear doctrine.

In my statement of 19 August, I outlined Pakistan's concerns regarding the nuclear doctrine released by India on 17 August this year. This morning the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan has delivered a statement in Islamabad at our Institute of Strategic Studies on the regional and global implications of India's nuclear doctrine. I have requested the secretariat to circulate the text of the Foreign Secretary's statement and I have asked that this be circulated also as an official document of this Conference.

The statement examines the developments since the nuclear tests in South Asia last year. It outlines Pakistan's positive response to the call for restraint in the development and deployment of nuclear arms and ballistic missiles. It explains the rationale for Pakistan's proposal for a strategic restraint regime in South Asia. The Foreign Secretary of Pakistan has drawn attention to the fact that the nuclear doctrine announced by India is a prescription for a massive militarization programme, both in the nuclear and conventional fields. It will create a new and far more dangerous round of instability in the region with operationally deployed and ready-to-use nuclear weapons. It is a clear rejection of all initiatives to curb an arms race in South Asia and will constitute the most serious obstacle to any prospects for nuclear and missile restraint in South Asia.

A lot has been said here about the fissile material so-called "cut-off" treaty, and we have heard of course the most rigorous advocacy of this from those who are perhaps new converts to the cause. As far as Pakistan is concerned, we are prepared to participate in negotiations when the CD commences next year, but as our Foreign Secretary has observed in his statement, "India's intention to manufacture 400 or more nuclear warheads is also of special concern to Pakistan. India will require substantial quantities of fissile material for such a large nuclear force. Under these circumstances, neither India nor Pakistan could accept the conclusion of an FMCT, much less a moratorium on fissile material production." In his statement, the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan has called on the international community to urge India to take 10 steps to reverse the dangerous implications of its nuclear doctrine. I will read these 10 steps which he has proposed. The world must ask India to assure its neighbours and the world that:

1. It will not conduct further nuclear tests. Until the CTBT comes into force, Pakistan and India could formalize their unilateral moratoriums into a binding bilateral arrangement;

2. It will not operationally deploy its nuclear weapons and will keep them in a non-deployed mode;

3. It will not build the hundreds of nuclear warheads as envisaged by its nuclear doctrine;

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

4. It will not produce or possess the large stocks of fissile materials which would enable it to build a large arsenal of nuclear weapons in the future. In this context, steps should be taken to achieve a balance between the unequal stockpiles of India and Pakistan;

5. It will not seek to create sea-based and submarine-based nuclear forces;

6. It will not seek to acquire, develop or deploy anti-ballistic missile systems which could escalate development and deployment of nuclear arms in the region;

7. It will refrain from any military-related actions in space;

8. It will review and restrain its plans for the acquisition and development of advanced aircraft, nuclear submarines and other technologically advanced weapons systems which could accentuate and accelerate the nuclear and conventional arms race in the region;

9. It will seriously address and resolve the outstanding issues with Pakistan, especially the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, with the active support and involvement of the international community; and

10. It will enter into negotiations with Pakistan to elaborate a strategic restraint regime for South Asia.

If the international community fails once again to deplore India's nuclear military escalation, Pakistan, which has so far restrained itself, will obviously be obliged to take the necessary action to ensure the credibility of its deterrence posture. Unfortunately, this would imply an end to any realistic prospects to prevent an open arms race in South Asia. It is ironic that the international community has failed to act in part because of actions of those who decry the inaction of the Conference on Disarmament. In particular, countries planning to sell advanced conventional weapons to India should carefully consider the consequences of adding qualitatively and quantitatively to India's massive conventional forces. This would further aggravate the conventional balance in South Asia and may compel Pakistan to place greater reliance on its nuclear and missile capabilities to deter India. Thus, sales of conventional arms and ABM systems to India will create a more unstable security situation in South Asia.

Mr. President, even at this late stage, Pakistan is committed to pursuing contacts and consultations with all the members of the international community in order to evolve a broadly agreed approach to deal with the threats to regional and global peace and security emerging from India's political and military ambitions as revealed in its nuclear doctrine. We hope that at this late stage we shall receive the positive response for which we have hoped for over 35 years.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of Pakistan for his comments, and I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of New Zealand, Ambassador Clive Pearson.

Mr. PEARSON (New Zealand): I wish to take the floor to comment on what appears to be a claim, made by the distinguished Ambassador of France in his statement this morning, that suggests that members of the New Agenda Coalition may be inconsistent in their support for negotiations on a fissile materials treaty.

Any such claim is totally incorrect and we reject it categorically. New Zealand has consistently supported early negotiations on a fissile materials treaty and we shall continue to do so as actively as we can nationally, with our New Agenda partners, and with all other countries supporting these negotiations.

We are, however, capable, as are the majority of members of this Conference, of making a clear distinction between using the process of preparing the CD's annual report to score points on the one hand, and the need for an annual report that is balanced and factually correct on the other.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of New Zealand for those comments. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of India, Ambassador Savitri Kunadi.

Ms. KUNADI (India): Mr. President, thank you for giving me the floor, and allow me to express the appreciation of my delegation at seeing you conduct our proceedings at an important juncture in the work of the Conference.

It was not my intention to take the floor this morning, but I have been constrained to do so in view of certain remarks made by the Ambassador of Pakistan relating to India's policy on nuclear weapons. As mentioned during my intervention in the plenary on 19 August, these comments are ill-informed and a result of misperceptions. Moreover, we have always maintained that the Conference on Disarmament is not the forum for a discussion of such issues. But since Pakistan has sought to raise it again today, we feel that the facts must again be set out clearly.

The document entitled "Indian nuclear doctrine" prepared by the National Security Advisory Board, which consists of eminent experts and strategic analysts, is one of the inputs for consideration by the Government. It is a draft and was released to the public in order to encourage discussion and debate at the wider public and political levels. This would constitute an important input for finalizing a doctrine after the general elections.

India believes that as a responsible nuclear-weapon State, it should have a clearly stated nuclear doctrine reflecting openness and transparency, which enables other countries to have a better appreciation and understanding of India's policies. Moreover, as a democracy, the decisions on issues relating to national security are always backed by national consensus. India's nuclear policy is the product of a national consensus and is not subject to external prescriptions or conditions.

(Ms. Kunadi, India)

I would like to reiterate that India believes that the use of nuclear weapons constitutes a grave threat to humanity and to peace and stability in the international system. Therefore, while we seek to build an international consensus for global nuclear disarmament, it is important that nuclear-weapon States accept their responsibility and define the objective of nuclear weapons as being limited to deterring the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by an adversary. As a responsible nuclear-weapon State, this is the role that India has defined for its nuclear arsenal. Accordingly, India has declared that it shall not be the first to initiate a nuclear strike, but shall respond with punitive retaliation if attacked with nuclear weapons. India shall also not resort to use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. We will not engage in an arms race or other sterile concepts of the cold war. Restraint is the watchword as far as India's nuclear policy is concerned. We therefore completely reject the aspersions that the Pakistani statement has sought to portray here today. Our nuclear doctrine provides negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States. India's doctrine serves to highlight the purely defensive character of our nuclear arsenal.

Pakistan's reaction to the draft document is inexplicable considering that in the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Foreign Secretaries of India and Pakistan on 21 February 1999 in Lahore, both countries had agreed to engage in bilateral consultations on security concepts and nuclear doctrines with a view to developing measures for confidence-building in the nuclear and the conventional fields. It is a matter of deep regret that instead of building upon the Lahore process, there has been an erosion of trust and deterioration in the bilateral environment because of Pakistan's aggression in Kargil. As a democracy, we certainly believe that the public articulation of the doctrine should be a sign of reassurance. In fact, the articulation of a "first use policy" of Pakistan implies a much higher level of operational alert and is contrary to the notion of restraint reflected in the Indian document. We cannot escape the conclusion that the statement by the delegation of Pakistan rings hollow.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of India for her statement and for the words of support addressed to the Chair. The distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan has requested the floor.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): I listened very carefully to the statement of my distinguished colleague from India, and I did so because I wished to hear from her the possibility of a positive response to the suggestions which the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan has made to India to arrest the dangers of a nuclear and conventional arms race in South Asia. While India has said that its nuclear doctrine is for debate, it is a fact that this doctrine is the consensus and final report of a Security Board established by the Prime Minister of India and that this report was released officially by the National Security Adviser to the Prime Minister of India. We cannot therefore but conclude that the report carries the official weight and support of the Government of India. If this is not the case, what we would then expect from the Government of India - and from the distinguished representative of India - is to say clearly at this Conference - or in any other public forum - that the

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

Government of India disavows the recommendations of this report. This would certainly constitute a confidence-building measure, not only with Pakistan but with the entire international community.

It is true that in Lahore we concluded a memorandum of understanding to build confidence, to discuss our respective nuclear doctrines and postures. What my colleague from India failed to mention was that in Lahore, Pakistan gave to the Indian side, to the Indian Prime Minister, a composite document setting out a strategic restraint regime for South Asia, a restraint regime encompassing nuclear restraint, conventional arms restraint, confidence-building measures and measures to resolve the disputes that exist between India and Pakistan. We did not receive a positive response to discuss that proposal. What we did agree upon was to discuss our respective nuclear doctrines. But it is strange that having agreed to discuss the nuclear doctrine, the next step which India would take is to publicly announce a doctrine which would constitute one of the most significant escalations anywhere in the world - 400 nuclear weapons operationally deployed on a triad of air-based, land-based and sea-based delivery systems.

Is that a confidence-building measure, or a confidence-eroding measure? Was Pakistan supposed to be happy with the declaration of such a doctrine? Is the international community supposed to be reassured by the announcement of such a doctrine, especially when it stipulates that it will be accompanied by a further build-up of conventional weapons as well? And therefore we call upon the international community to take note of this doctrine, to express its concern about this doctrine, to call on India not to implement this doctrine, and at the same time we call on those States which are engaged in the sales of massive conventional arms to India, which would contribute to further imbalance in the security environment in South Asia and accentuate the nuclear threat in our region - we call upon them to halt those sales and not to come to this Conference to preach virtue while they practice vice on a massive scale on our subcontinent.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan for his further statement this morning. That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor at this stage? I see none.

As I mentioned earlier, I shall now suspend the plenary meeting and convene, in five minutes' time, an informal plenary to consider our draft annual report to the United Nations General Assembly.

The meeting was suspended at 11.35 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: I should like now to call to order the resumed 836th plenary meeting of the Conference.

(The President)

I shall now invite you to formalize the provisional agreements reached at the informal plenary meeting on the draft annual report as contained in document CD/WP.503/Rev.1. Since we were able to go through the draft annual report paragraph by paragraph at the informal plenary meeting, and in accordance with past practice, I shall proceed to the adoption of our annual report section by section.

May I take it that section I, entitled "Introduction", is adopted?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: May I take it that section II, entitled "Organization of work of the Conference", is adopted?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: May I take it that section III, entitled "Substantive work of the Conference during its 1999 session", is adopted? It is understood that a new document, submitted by Pakistan today, will be listed in paragraph 37 as document CD/1594 under (I).

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: May I now take it that the annual report in its entirety, as contained in document CD/WP.503/Rev.1 and as just orally revised, is adopted?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I thank you for your support in that process. The secretariat will issue the report as an official document in all official languages of the Conference as soon as possible.

Is there any delegation that wishes to take the floor at this stage? I see none. In that case, I shall proceed to make a few concluding remarks of my own.

We have all experienced disappointment that the CD has not made more of a contribution to the further development of the international security system this year. We often console ourselves that the CD can only be a microcosm of the wider international environment, which, from many perspectives, has provided difficult challenges over the last couple of years.

Ultimately, however, the CD is the sum of its parts - of the policies, perspectives and political will of its constituent States. In retrospect we may see the past year or so as one of realignment of those parts with the remaining (and emerging) international security challenges. Perhaps 1999 will after all have been a period of useful preparation for future negotiations notwithstanding our very strong collective sense of missed opportunity.

(The President)

With this perspective, I believe I can say that we have taken a positive step towards the end of our session this year. I would not put it as any more than that, but we have taken a step in deciding to try and complete work on our partially constructed programme of work through continuing Presidential consultations even after our formal session ends. I hope this process will indeed bring us closer to early substantive work. I hope it will bring us closer to undertaking fissile material negotiations, for which there is already a compelling international priority and impetus. I hope it will bring us closer to taking up the genuine interest in an exchange of information and ideas which could contribute to further nuclear disarmament. I hope it will bring us closer to addressing resurgent concerns about the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and I hope it will bring us closer to substantive work on the other widely shared work programme priorities. Judging from this morning's discussion, the gravity and urgency of getting down to work has been very thoroughly underlined in several statements in the debate.

As I said, it is my sense that we have got to the end of our year with a positive frame of mind. In the past few weeks delegations have conveyed to me a strong desire to get the Conference back to work. Having spent 1999 "narrowing the gaps" on some key issues, we should not waste any further time at the beginning of 2000.

Our collective spirit is, I believe, captured by the Presidential statement which we have agreed (report, para. 38). I very much appreciated your valuable cooperation in the achievement of that statement, and I look forward to your continuing support in working over the inter-sessional period to resolve our differences on the outstanding issues in the programme of work.

I should now like to make some more particular comments about the programme of work. My predecessors have, through their own consultations, narrowed the scope of the task before me. In this regard I should like to pay particular tribute to the efforts of the Ambassador of Algeria, Ambassador Dembri.

Ambassador Dembri identified the two pending issues in the programme of work: nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. My immediate predecessor, Ambassador González of Argentina, viewed Ambassador Dembri's proposals as the best way forward towards an agreement on these two issues. I share his assessment and intend to build on Ambassador Dembri's proposals in my consultations.

If I may refer again to the efforts of my predecessor Ambassador González, I would also share his assessment that the Conference's future programme of work, which would include appropriate mechanisms on nuclear disarmament and PAROS, would also encompass the following:

First, the re-establishment of the ad hoc committee under agenda item 1 to negotiate, on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory,

(The President)

multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices;

Second, the re-establishment of the ad hoc committee under agenda item 4 to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons;

Third, the reappointment of a special coordinator under agenda item 6 to seek the views of the members of the Conference on the most appropriate way to deal with the questions related to anti-personnel mines, taking into account, inter alia, developments outside the Conference;

Fourth, the reappointment of a special coordinator under agenda item 7, entitled "Transparency in armaments", to seek the views of the members of the Conference on the most appropriate way to deal with questions related to this item;

Fifth, the reappointment of special coordinators to consider the review of the agenda of the Conference, the expansion of its membership and its improved and effective functioning.

The proposed re-establishment of these two ad hoc committees, and reappointment of these special coordinators, constitute the common elements in all of the proposals which have been put forward this year on the establishment of a comprehensive programme of work. These include draft decisions by Ambassador Grey of the United States (CD/1566) and Ambassador Cedeño of Venezuela (CD/1575) the proposal for a programme of work put forward by the Group of 21 (CD/1570), and that put forward by the United States, the United Kingdom and France (CD/1586).

The existence of these elements of the programme of work in each of these documents reflects the broad view that these are all issues which should be part of our programme of work. No doubt individual delegations would put different emphases on these items of they were designing their very own programme of work. However, as a result of the consensus nature of our work, they are all recognized as being core elements of a balanced and comprehensive programme of work.

My task, and the task of the incoming President, remains that which was previously outlined by Ambassador Dembri - to bring the Conference to the stage where it can begin work on items on which there exists a broad measure of agreement, by securing compromise on the items which are not yet agreed. I believe we are not far from that agreement. However, often the last remaining steps towards agreement are the hardest, and I am under no illusion that agreement on the outstanding two issues will be an easy task. It is also a task which I can only undertake if the political will exists for me to do so.

I propose to be energetic in that assignment which has been given me and also to my predecessor and my successor in the inter-sessional period and to

(The President)

be conscientious in ensuring that consultations are open and fair-minded, that I consult widely and openly and that they are most of all transparent to all participants in this Conference. I shall make special efforts to ensure that no delegation is disadvantaged by either the locality or the intensity of other work that we may some of us be engaged in this period.

Finally, on my own behalf, and also on behalf of the members of the Conference, I would like to extend my most sincere thanks to the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Valadimir Petrovsky, and the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, and all the members of the secretariat, for their invaluable assistance and advice. I also wish to thank the interpreters for their skill and patience, especially over the last few days when debate was flowing freely and we were budging all around various documents.

On my own behalf, I would also like to thank the Group Coordinators, the Ambassadors of Bulgaria, Indonesia and Italy, and also the Ambassador of China, for their assistance and wise counsel over the past few weeks, and I forewarn them that I may need to call on them again for assistance in the forthcoming months. I have greatly appreciated this opportunity to work very closely with all members of the Conference and to get to know colleagues even better, and I look forward to continuing this cooperation in the inter-sessional period, including of course with Ambassador Kreid of Austria, to whom I offer my wishes for an expeditious and, dare I say, precipitous start to our work in 2000.

This concludes our business for today and the 1999 session of the Conference.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 18 January 2000, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.